arXiv:1608.02368v1 [math.OC] 8 Aug 2016

Neumann boundary feedback stabilization for a nonlinear wave equation: A strict H^2-Lyapunov function

Martin Gugat[a], Günter Leugering[a] and Ke Wang[a,b]

[a]Lehrstuhl 2 für Angewandte Mathematik
Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg
Cauerstr. 11, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

[b]School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China

AMS Subject Classifications:76N25, 35L51, 35L53, 93C20.

Keywords: Boundary feedback control, feedback stabilization, exponential stability, isothermal Euler equations, second-order quasilinear equation, Lyapunov function, stationary state, non-stationary state, gas pipeline.

This work was supported by DFG in the framework of the Collaborative Research Centre CRC/Transregio 154, Mathematical Modelling, Simulation and Optimization Using the Example of Gas Networks, project C03 and A05.

Abstract

For a system that is governed by the isothermal Euler equations with friction for ideal gas, the corresponding field of characteristic curves is determined by the velocity of the flow. This velocity is determined by a second-order quasilinear hyperbolic equation. For the corresponding initial-boundary value problem with Neumann-boundary feedback, we consider non-stationary solutions locally around a stationary state on a finite time interval and discuss the well-posedness of this kind of problem. We introduce a strict H^2-Lyapunov function and show that the boundary feedback constant can be chosen such that the H^2-Lyapunov function and hence also the H^2-norm of the difference between the non-stationary and the stationary state decays exponentially with time.

1 Introduction

The flow of gas through a pipeline is modelled by the isothermal Euler equations with friction. In the operation of gas pipelines, it is essential that the velocities remain below critical values where vibrations occur and noise is created, see [36]. We study a quasilinear wave equation for the gas velocity in the case of ideal gas which is derived from the isothermal Euler equations with friction. Using Neumann feedback at one end of the pipe, we stabilize the solution of the corresponding initial-boundary value problem with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions at the other end of the pipe to a desired subsonic stationary state. Except for its nonlinearity, this system is of a similar form as the system with the linear wave equation which has been studied for example in [24].

The first results on the boundary feedback stabilization for a quasilinear wave equation have been obtained by M. Slemrod in [32] and J. Greenberg & T. Li in [13] by using the method of characteristics. In [8], J.-M. Coron, B. d'Andrea-Novel & G. Bastin constructed a strict H^2-Lyapunov function for the boundary control of hyperbolic systems of conservation laws without source term. In [9], they constructed a strict H^2-Lyapunov for quasilinear hyperbolic systems with dissipative boundary conditions without source term. More recently in [7], Coron and Bastin study the Lyapunov stability of the C^1-norm for quasilinear hyperbolic systems of the first order. They consider W_p^1–Lyapunov functions for $p < \infty$ and look at the limit for $p \to \infty$.

Based upon [8], M. Dick, M. Gugat & G. Leugering considered the isothermal Euler equations with friction with Dirichlet boundary feedback at both ends of the system and introduced a strict H^1-Lyapunov function, which is a weighted and squared H^1-norm of the difference between the nonstationary and the stationary state. They developed Dirichlet boundary feedback conditions which guarantee that the H^1-norm of the difference between the non-stationary and the stationary state decays exponentially with time (see [11]). In [18], we have defined a strict H^2-Lyapunov function for this stabilization problem. In contrast to [8], [11] and [18] in the present paper a Neumann boundary feedback law is used at one end of the interval for the stabilization of the system. This is motivated by the nice properties of the corresponding Neumann feedback for the linear wave equation that leads to finite-time stabilization for a certain feedback parameter, see [24], [1].

In our paper, by constructing a strict H^2-Lyapunov function and choosing suitable boundary feedback conditions, we give results about the boundary feedback stabilization for a second-order quasilinear hyperbolic equation with source term. The exponential decay of the solution of a second-order quasilinear hyperbolic equation is established. This solution measures the difference between the present state and a desired stationary state, which is in general not constant for our system.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we consider the isothermal Euler equations both in physical variables and in terms of Riemann invariants. Then we transform the isothermal Euler equations to a second-order quasilinear hyperbolic equation. In Section 3 we state a result about the well-posedness of general second-order quasilinear hyperbolic systems on a finite time interval (see Lemma 3.1). Our main results about the exponential decay of the H^2-norm and C^1-norm are presented in Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.7 in Section 4.2. The proofs of Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.7 are given in Section 5. The infinite time horizon case is studied in Section 6. We show that due to the stabilization, the solution exists globally in time.

2 The isothermal Euler equations and a quasilinear wave equation

In this section, we present the isothermal Euler equations with friction for a single pipe both in terms of the physical variables and in terms of Riemann invariants.

Let a finite time $T > 0$ be given. The system dynamics for the gas flow in a single pipe can be modeled by a hyperbolic system, which is described by the

isothermal Euler equations (see [4],[5],[11]):

$$\rho_t + q_x = 0, \tag{1}$$

$$q_t + \left(\frac{q^2}{\rho} + a^2\rho\right)_x = -\frac{f_g}{2\delta}\frac{q|q|}{\rho}, \tag{2}$$

where $\rho = \rho(t,x) > 0$ is the density of the gas, $q = q(t,x)$ is the mass flux, the constant $f_g > 0$ is a friction factor, $\delta > 0$ is the diameter of the pipe and $a > 0$ is the sonic velocity in the gas. We consider the equations on the domain $\Omega := [0,T] \times [0,L]$. Equation (1) states the conservation of mass and equation (2) is the momentum equation. We use the notation

$$\theta = \frac{f_g}{\delta}.$$

In this paper, we consider positive gas flow in subsonic or subcritical states, that is,

$$0 < \frac{q}{\rho} < a. \tag{3}$$

The isothermal Euler equations (1) and (2) give rise to the second-order equation

$$\tilde{u}_{tt} + 2\tilde{u}\,\tilde{u}_{tx} - (a^2 - \tilde{u}^2)\,\tilde{u}_{xx} = \tilde{F}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}_x, \tilde{u}_t), \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{u}$ is the unknown function and satisfies

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{q}{\rho}, \tag{5}$$

that is $\tilde{u}$ is the velocity of the gas. The lower order term is

$$\tilde{F}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}_x, \tilde{u}_t) = -2\tilde{u}_t\tilde{u}_x - 2\tilde{u}\tilde{u}_x^2 - \frac{3}{2}\theta\tilde{u}|\tilde{u}|\tilde{u}_x - \theta|\tilde{u}|\tilde{u}_t. \tag{6}$$

From the velocity $\tilde{u}$, the density ρ can be obtained from the initial value and the differential equation

$$(\ln\rho)_t = \frac{1}{a^2}\left(\tilde{u}\tilde{u}_t + (\tilde{u}^2 - a^2)\,\tilde{u}_x + \frac{1}{2}\theta\,|\tilde{u}|\tilde{u}^2\right). \tag{7}$$

Then q can be obtained from the equation $q = \rho\,\tilde{u}$.

To stabilize the system governed by the quasilinear wave equation (4) locally around a given stationary state $\bar{u}(x)$, we use the boundary feedback law

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{u}_x(0) = \bar{u}_x(0) + k\,\tilde{u}_t(0), \\ &\tilde{u}(L) = \bar{u}(L), \end{aligned}$$

with a feedback parameter $k \in (0,\infty)$.

In terms of the physical variables (q,ρ), the boundary feedback law is

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{at } x = 0 : q_x - (\ln(\rho))_x\,q = \rho\,\bar{u}_x(0) + k\,[q_t - (\ln(\rho))_t\,q]\,, \\ &\text{at } x = L : q = \bar{u}(L)\,\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Sufficient conditions for the exponential stability of this system will be presented in Theorem 4.5 in Section 4.2.

2.1 The Riemann invariants and a differential equation for ρ in terms of the velocity

For classical solutions the isothermal Euler equations (1) and (2) can be equivalently written as the following system

$$\partial_t \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ q \end{pmatrix} + \hat{A}(\rho, q)\ \partial_x \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ q \end{pmatrix} = \hat{G}(\rho, q) \tag{8}$$

with the matrix

$$\hat{A}(\rho, q) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ a^2 - \frac{q^2}{\rho^2} & 2\frac{q}{\rho} \end{pmatrix}$$

and the source term

$$\hat{G}(\rho, q) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -\frac{\theta}{2}\frac{|q|\, q}{\rho} \end{pmatrix}.$$

System (8) has two eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_-(\rho, q)$, $\tilde{\lambda}_+(\rho, q)$ and in the subsonic case we have

$$\tilde{\lambda}_-(\rho, q) = \frac{q}{\rho} - a < 0 < \tilde{\lambda}_+(\rho, q) = \frac{q}{\rho} + a. \tag{9}$$

In terms of the Riemann invariants $R_\pm = R_\pm(\rho, q) = -\frac{q}{\rho} \mp a \ln(\rho)$ the system (8) has the diagonal form

$$\partial_t \begin{pmatrix} R_+ \\ R_- \end{pmatrix} + \hat{D}(R_+, R_-)\ \partial_x \begin{pmatrix} R_+ \\ R_- \end{pmatrix} = \hat{S}(R_+, R_-), \tag{10}$$

where

$$\hat{D}(R_+, R_-) := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\lambda}_+ & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\lambda}_- \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{R_+ + R_-}{2} + a & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{R_+ + R_-}{2} - a \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\hat{S}(R_+, R_-) := \frac{\theta}{8}\,(R_+ + R_-)\,|R_+ + R_-| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

In terms of $R_\pm$, for the physical variables ρ and q we have

$$\rho = \exp\left(\frac{R_- - R_+}{2a}\right), \tag{12}$$

$$q = -\frac{R_+ + R_-}{2} \exp\left(\frac{R_- - R_+}{2a}\right). \tag{13}$$

A gas flow is positive and subsonic (i.e. $0 < q/\rho < a$) if and only if

$$-2a < R_+(t, x) + R_-(t, x) < 0 \text{ for all } (t, x) \in \Omega. \tag{14}$$

For the velocity $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(\rho, q)$ defined in (5) we have

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{R_+ + R_-}{-2}. \tag{15}$$

Due to (9), we can express the velocity in terms of the eigenvalues as

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_+ + \tilde{\lambda}_-}{2}.$$

Due to equation (15), (10) yields the second-order equation (4). A detailed derivation can be found in [21]. The second-order quasilinear equation (4) is hyperbolic with the eigenvalues

$$\tilde{\lambda}_- = \tilde{u} - a < 0 < \tilde{\lambda}_+ = \tilde{u} + a. \tag{16}$$

Using the isothermal Euler equations (1) and (2), we obtain the partial derivatives of $\tilde{u}$ with respect to t and x, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{u}_t &= \frac{q_t}{\rho} - \frac{q\rho_t}{\rho^2} \\
&= -\frac{1}{\rho}\left(\frac{q^2}{\rho} + a^2\rho\right)_x - \frac{q\rho_t}{\rho^2} - \frac{\theta}{2}\frac{q\,|q|}{\rho^2} \\
&= \tilde{u}\frac{\rho_t}{\rho} + (\tilde{u}^2 - a^2)\frac{\rho_x}{\rho} - \frac{\theta}{2}\tilde{u}\,|\tilde{u}|
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{u}_x = \frac{q_x}{\rho} - \frac{q\rho_x}{\rho^2} = -\frac{\rho_t}{\rho} - \tilde{u}\frac{\rho_x}{\rho}.$$

Multiplying $\tilde{u}_t$ and $\tilde{u}_x$ by $\tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{u}^2 - a^2$, respectively, by adding the two equations we obtain (7), which means that ρ and q can be obtained from $\tilde{u}$ and the initial data. Note that since $\tilde{u} = \frac{q}{\rho}$, we have the same value for $\tilde{u}$ for λq and $\lambda\rho$ where $\lambda \in (0, 1]$. So we cannot expect to recover the values of (q, ρ) from $\tilde{u}$ without additional information on (q, ρ). In a similar way as (7), we obtain the equation

$$\ln(\rho)_x = -\frac{1}{a^2}\left(\tilde{u}_t + \tilde{u}\,\tilde{u}_x + \frac{\theta}{2}|\tilde{u}|\,\tilde{u}\right). \tag{17}$$

Thus if $\tilde{u}$ is known, the values of ρ can be determined from the value of ρ at a boundary point ($x = 0$ or $x = L$) and (17) by integration.

2.2 Stationary states of the system

In [12] the existence, uniqueness and the properties of stationary subsonic C^1-solutions $(\bar{\rho}(x), \bar{q}(x))$ of the isothermal Euler equations have been discussed. The stationary states of the system on networks are studied in [16].

Here we focus on the stationary states of (4). Let $\bar{u} = \bar{u}(x)$ denote a stationary state for the second-order equation (4). Then (4) yields the following second-order ordinary differential equations for $\bar{u}(x)$:

$$(a^2 - \bar{u}^2(x))\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\bar{u}(x) = 2\bar{u}(x)\Big(\frac{d}{dx}\bar{u}(x)\Big)^2 + \frac{3}{2}\theta\bar{u}(x)\,|\bar{u}(x)|\,\frac{d}{dx}\bar{u}(x). \tag{18}$$

This implies that equation (4) has constant stationary states $\bar{u} \in (-\infty, \infty)$ that can attain arbitrary real values. In contrast to this situation, the isothermal Euler equations with friction (that is (1), (2)) do not have constant stationary states

except for the case of velocity zero. The stationary states of (1), (2) have been studied in [16]. Now we consider the question: Given a constant state $\bar{u} = \lambda \in (0, \infty)$, is there a solution (q, ρ) of (1), (2) that corresponds to the constant velocity $\bar{u}$? For $\lambda = 0$ we obtain the constant solution of (1), (2) where $q = 0$. For $\lambda > 0$ there is a corresponding solution of travelling wave type (in particular the corresponding solution of (1), (2) is not stationary), namely

$$(q(t,x), \rho(t,x)) = (\lambda\, \alpha(\lambda\, t - x),\ \alpha(\lambda t - x)) \tag{19}$$

where the function α is given by

$$\alpha(z) = C\, \exp\left(\frac{\lambda^2 \theta}{2\, a^2} z\right) \tag{20}$$

and $C > 0$ is a positive constant. Equation (18) can be rewritten in the form

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left((a^2 - \bar{u}^2(x))\bar{u}_x(x) - \frac{\theta}{2}|\bar{u}(x)|\, \bar{u}^2(x)\right) = 0. \tag{21}$$

Thus for every stationary state $\bar{u}$ of (4) there exists a constant $\lambda \in (-\infty, \infty)$ such that $\bar{u}$ satisfies the first order ordinary differential equation

$$(a^2 - \bar{u}^2(x))\bar{u}_x(x) = \lambda + \frac{\theta}{2}|\bar{u}|\, \bar{u}^2(x). \tag{22}$$

We use the notation $\bar{u}_0 := \bar{u}(0)$. Assume that $\bar{u}_0 \in (0, a)$. Let $[0, x_0)$ denote the maximal existence interval of the solution. For the solutions that are not constant, we have two cases:

If $\lambda + \frac{\theta}{2}\, \bar{u}_0^3 > 0$, $\bar{u}$ is strictly increasing on $[0, x_0)$ and

$$\lim_{x \to x_0 -} \bar{u}(x) = a, \lim_{x \to x_0 -} \frac{d}{dx}\bar{u}(x) = +\infty, \lim_{x \to x_0 -} \frac{d^2}{dx^2}\bar{u}(x) = +\infty\,.$$

If $\lambda + \frac{\theta}{2}\, \bar{u}_0^3 < 0$, $\bar{u}$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, x_0)$ and

$$\lim_{x \to x_0 -} \bar{u}(x) = -a, \lim_{x \to x_0 -} \frac{d}{dx}\bar{u}(x) = -\infty, \lim_{x \to x_0 -} \frac{d^2}{dx^2}\bar{u}(x) = -\infty\,.$$

For stationary ρ and $\tilde{u}$, equation (7) implies (22) with $\lambda = 0$. The stationary states that correspond to $\lambda \neq 0$ cannot be deduced from the stationary states of (1), (2). Thus all the stationary solutions of (4) that correspond to a stationary state of (1), (2) must satisfy the equation

$$\bar{u}'(0) = \frac{\theta}{2}\frac{|\bar{u}_0|\, \bar{u}_0^2}{a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2}. \tag{23}$$

The following Lemma contains an explicit representation for these stationary velocities.

Lemma 2.1 *Let a subsonic stationary state $\bar{u}(x) > 0$ for $x \in [0, L]$ that is not constant and satisfies (23) be given. Let $W_{-1}(x)$ denote the real branch of the Lambert W–function (see [6, 25]) with $W_{-1}(x) \leq -1$. Then the following equation holds for all $x \in [0, L]$:*

$$(\bar{u}(x))^2 = \frac{a^2}{-W_{-1}(-\exp(\theta\, x + \bar{C}))},$$

where $\bar{C}$ is a real constant such that $\bar{C} \leq -1 - \theta L$.

Proof 2.1 *Separation of variables yields*

$$x + \hat{C} = \int \frac{a^2 - \bar{u}(x)^2}{\frac{\theta}{2}\bar{u}(x)^3}\,\bar{u}'(x)\,dx = -\frac{1}{\theta}\left[\ln(a^2) + \ln\left(\frac{\bar{u}(x)^2}{a^2}\right) + \frac{a^2}{\bar{u}(x)^2}\right].$$

Define $\xi = \frac{a^2}{\bar{u}(x)^2} \in (1,\,\infty)$. *We have* $\xi + \ln(1/\xi) = \xi - \ln(\xi)$. *Thus*

$$-\exp(\theta x + \theta\hat{C} + \ln(a^2)) = -\exp(-\xi + \ln(\xi)) = (-\xi)\exp(-\xi).$$

Now the definition of W_{-1} *as the inverse function of* $z\exp(z)$ *for* $z \in (-\infty, -1)$ *yields the assertion.*

Since for the stationary states (q, ρ) of (1), (2) the flow rate q is constant, by (5) we get the corresponding density as $\rho(x) = \frac{q}{\bar{u}(x)}$.

3 Well-posedness of the system locally around stationary states

Now we consider non-stationary solutions locally around a subsonic stationary state $\bar{u}(x) > 0$ on Ω that satisfies (22) with $\lambda = 0$, that is that corresponds to a stationary state of (1), (2). For a solution $\tilde{u}(t,x)$ of (4), define

$$u(t,x) = \tilde{u}(t,x) - \bar{u}(x). \tag{24}$$

Then (4), (18) and (22) yield the equation

$$u_{tt} + 2(\bar{u}+u)u_{tx} - \Big(a^2 - (\bar{u}+u)^2\Big)u_{xx} = F(x,u,u_x,u_t), \tag{25}$$

where $F := F(x,u,u_x,u_t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \tilde{F}(u+\bar{u},\,u_x+\bar{u}_x\,,u_t) + \frac{a^2-(\bar{u}+u)^2}{a^2-\bar{u}^2}\,\bar{u}\left(2(\bar{u}_x)^2 + \frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,|\bar{u}|\,\bar{u}_x\right) && (26)\\ &= \tilde{F}(u+\bar{u},\,u_x+\bar{u}_x\,,u_t) - \frac{a^2-(\bar{u}+u)^2}{a^2-\bar{u}^2}\,\tilde{F}(\bar{u},\,\bar{u}_x\,,0). && (27)\end{aligned}$$

If $\bar{u} \geq 0$ and $\bar{u} + u \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(u+\bar{u},\,u_x+\bar{u}_x\,,u_t) &= \tilde{F}(\bar{u},\bar{u}_x,0) + \tilde{F}(u,u_x,u_t)\\ -2\,\bar{u}\,u_x^2 - 2\,\bar{u}_x\,u_t - 4\,\bar{u}_x\,u\,u_x - 2\,\bar{u}_x^2\,u - 4\,\bar{u}\,\bar{u}_x\,u_x\\ -3\,\theta\,\bar{u}\,u\,u_x - \frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,\bar{u}^2\,u_x - \frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,\bar{u}_x\,u^2 - 3\,\theta\,\bar{u}_x\bar{u}\,u - \theta\,\bar{u}\,u_t.\end{aligned}$$

Using

$$\bar{u}_x = \frac{\theta}{2}\,\frac{1}{a^2-\bar{u}^2}\,\bar{u}^3$$

this yields

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \tilde{F}(u,u_x,u_t) - \theta^2\frac{3a^4\bar{u}^4 - 2a^2\bar{u}^6 + \bar{u}^8}{2(a^2-\bar{u}^2)^3}\,u - \theta\,\frac{a^2\bar{u}}{a^2-\bar{u}^2}\,u_t - \theta\,\frac{\bar{u}^4+3a^2\bar{u}^2}{2(a^2-\bar{u}^2)}\,u_x\\ &- \theta^2\,\frac{2\bar{u}^7 - 3a^2\bar{u}^5 + 3a^4\bar{u}^3}{4(a^2-\bar{u}^2)^3}\,u^2 - 2\,\bar{u}\,u_x^2 - \theta\,\frac{3a^2\bar{u}-\bar{u}^3}{a^2-\bar{u}^2}\,u\,u_x \end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

with $\tilde{F}$ as defined in (6). For the second-order quasilinear hyperbolic equation (25), we consider the initial conditions

$$t = 0: \ u = \varphi(x), \ u_t = \psi(x), \quad x \in [0, L] \tag{29}$$

and the boundary feedback conditions

$$x = 0: \ u_x = k\, u_t, \tag{30}$$

$$x = L: \ u = 0, \tag{31}$$

where $k > 0$ is a real constant. We work in the framework of classical semi-global solutions. To apply the theory presented in [35], the second order equation is written as a first order system (see the proof of Theorem 1 in [28]). In this way the following result can be obtained (see Lemma 1 in [28]):

Lemma 3.1 *Let a subsonic stationary state $\bar{u}(x) > 0$ as in Lemma 2.1 be given. Choose $T > 0$ arbitrarily large.*

There exist constants $\varepsilon_0(T) > 0$ and $C_T > 0$, such that if the initial data $(\varphi(x), \psi(x)) \in C^2([0, L]) \times C^1([0, L])$ satisfies

$$\max\left\{\|\varphi(x)\|_{C^2([0,L])}, \ \|\psi(x))\|_{C^1([0,L])}\right\} \leq \varepsilon_0(T) \tag{32}$$

and the C^2-compatibility conditions are satisfied at the points $(t, x) = (0, 0)$ and $(0, L)$, then the initial-boundary problem (25),(29),(30)-(31) has a unique solution $u(t, x) \in C^2([0, T] \times [0, L])$. Moreover the following estimate holds:

$$\|u\|_{C^2([0,T]\times[0,L])} \leq C_T \max\left\{\|\varphi(x)\|_{C^2([0,L])}, \ \|\psi(x))\|_{C^1([0,L])}\right\}. \tag{33}$$

4 Exponential stability

In this section, we introduce a strict H^2-Lyapunov function for the closed-loop system consisting of the quasilinear wave equation (25) and the boundary conditions (30), (31). To motivate the choice of the Lyapunov function, let us reconsider the classical energy for systems governed by the linear wave equation $u_{tt} - c^2\, u_{xx} = 0$, which is $\int_0^L c^2\,(u_x)^2 + (u_t)^2\, dx$. In our quasilinear wave equation (25), instead of the square of the wave speed c^2 the term $(a^2 - (\bar{u} + u)^2)$ appears as a factor in front of u_{xx}, so it makes sense to replace c^2 by this expression in the definition of our Lyapunov function. In the same line of reasoning, if our quasilinear equation would be

$$u_{tt} - (a^2 - (\bar{u} + u)^2)\, u_{xx} = F,$$

the integral $\int_0^L (a^2 - (\bar{u} + u)^2)\,(u_x)^2 + (u_t)^2\, dx$ would be a candidate for a Lyapunov function. However, in our wave equation also the term $2(\bar{u} + u)u_{tx}$ appears. In order to deal with this term, we introduce an additional quantity in our Lyapunov function in such a way that, via equation (25), we can find an upper bound for its time-derivative. For this purpose, it makes sense to introduce a term that contains the product $u_t\, u_x$ in the integral defining the first part of our Lyapunov function. As a further motivation, we return to the linear wave equation $u_{tt} - u_{xx} = 0$ with the associated boundary conditions $u(t, 0) = 0$ and $u_t(t, L) = -k u_x(t, L)$ with $k > 0$. For a number $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2k}{L(1+k^2)})$, the quantity

$$E(t) = \int_0^L (u_x)^2 + (u_t)^2 \ + \lambda\, x\, u_x\, u_t dx$$

can be used to show the exponential decay, since $E'(t) \leq -\lambda\,(1-\lambda L)\,E(t)$.

For many hyperbolic systems exponential weights in the Lyapunov function have been used successfully, see various examples in [10]. We define the weights

$$h_1(x) = |k|, \tag{34}$$

$$h_2(x) = \exp\left(-\frac{x}{L}\right). \tag{35}$$

In the sequel we consider

$$E_1(t) = \int_0^L h_1(x)\left((a^2-(\bar{u}+u)^2)\,u_x^2+u_t^2\right) - 2\,h_2(x)\left((\bar{u}+u)u_x^2+u_t\,u_x\right)dx$$

since according to the previous considerations, this is a natural candidate to define a Lyapunov function for our system.

To show the exponential decay with respect to the H^2-norm, it is necessary to deal with the second order derivatives. Therefore we also introduce $E_2(t)$ which is defined analogously to E_1 to show the decay of the partial derivatives of second order. We define

$$E_2(t) = \int_0^L h_1(x)\Big((a^2-(\bar{u}+u)^2)u_{xx}^2+u_{tx}^2\Big) - 2\,h_2(x)\left((\bar{u}+u)u_{xx}^2+u_{tx}u_{xx}\right)dx.$$

We define the Lyapunov function $E(t)$ as

$$E(t) = E_1(t) + E_2(t). \tag{36}$$

In the following subsection we show that our Lyapunov function $E(t)$ as defined in (36) is bounded above and below by the product of appropriate constants and the square of the H^2-norm of u.

4.1 Equivalence of $\sqrt{E(t)}$ with $E(t)$ as in (36) and the H^2-norm of the state

In this section we show that $\sqrt{E(t)}$ with $E(t)$ as in (36) is equivalent to the H^2-norm of the state. This is a an essential property of a Lyapunov function since we want to use it to show the exponential decay of the H^2-norm. Note that the constants in Lemma 4.1 are independent of the length T of the time interval.

Lemma 4.1 *Let a real number*

$$\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}] \tag{37}$$

be given. Choose a real number $k > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{k} \in (0,\ (1-\gamma)\,a). \tag{38}$$

Assume that $\bar{u}$ is such that we have

$$\bar{u} \in (0,\ \gamma\,a). \tag{39}$$

Then for the weights defined in (34), (35) on the interval $[0, L]$ we have the strict inequality

$$h_2 \quad < \quad (a-\bar{u})\,h_1. \tag{40}$$

In addition, we assume that $\bar{u}$ is sufficiently small in the sense that

$$\sup_{x\in[0,L]} \frac{\bar{u}\,(a^2-\bar{u}^2)}{a^2+3\,\bar{u}^2} < \frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,k}. \tag{41}$$

Then for the weights we have the inequality

$$h_2 > \frac{\bar{u}(a^2-\bar{u}^2)}{a^2+3\bar{u}^2} 2\,h_1. \tag{42}$$

For a real number z define

$$b_{11}(z) = 1 + 2\,z\,k - \frac{(1+2\,z\,k)^2}{k^2\,(a^2-z^2)}. \tag{43}$$

Assume that

$$\upsilon > k^2. \tag{44}$$

Define the matrix

$$\tilde{B}_3(z) = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}(z) & \frac{1+2\,z\,k}{k\,(a^2-z^2)} - k \\ \frac{1+2\,z\,k}{k\,(a^2-z^2)} - k & \upsilon - \frac{1}{a^2-z^2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{45}$$

For a real number z define

$$C_g(z) = \frac{a^2-z^2}{\mathrm{e}\,z^2\left(2+\frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,z+\frac{2\,\theta\,z^3}{a^2-z^2}\right)^2} \tag{46}$$

Define the matrix

$$\tilde{A}_3(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,\frac{a^2+3z^2}{a^2-z^2} - 2\,k\,z & k - \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,\frac{2\,z}{a^2-z^2} \\ k - \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,\frac{2\,z}{a^2-z^2} & C_g(z) + \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,\frac{1}{a^2-z^2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{47}$$

Then there exists $\varepsilon_1(\upsilon) > 0$ such that for all z with $|z| \le 2\,\varepsilon_1(\upsilon)$ the matrix $\tilde{B}_3(z)$ is positive definite and the matrix $\tilde{A}_3(z)$ is positive definite.

Proof 4.1 *First we show that (40) holds. This is equivalent to the inequality*

$$\frac{1}{k} < \inf_{x\in[0,L]} \exp(\frac{1}{L}\,x)(a-\bar{u}(x)).$$

Our assumptions (38) and (39) imply that

$$\frac{1}{k} < (1-\gamma)\,a \le \inf_{x\in[0,L]} (a-\bar{u}(x)) \le \inf_{x\in[0,L]} \exp\left(\frac{1}{L}\,x\right)(a-\bar{u}(x)),$$

and (40) follows. If (41) holds, we have

$$\left(\frac{h_2}{h_1}\right) \ge \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}\,k} > \sup_{x\in[0,\,L]} \frac{2\,\bar{u}\,(a^2-\bar{u}^2)}{a^2+3\bar{u}^2}$$

and (42) follows.

Now we come to the assertion for the symmetric matrix $\tilde{B}_3$. Due to (38) we have $b_{11}(0) = 1 - \frac{1}{k^2\,a^2} > 0$. Due to the continuity of $b_{11}(\cdot)$ this implies that there exists a constant $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that for all $|z| \le 2\,\varepsilon_1$ we have $b_{11}(z) > 0$. We have

$$\det \tilde{B}_3(0) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{1}{k^2\,a^2} & \frac{1}{k\,a^2} - k \\ \frac{1}{k\,a^2} - k & \upsilon - \frac{1}{a^2} \end{pmatrix} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k^2\,a^2}\right)(\upsilon - k^2).$$

Hence (44) implies $\det \tilde{B}_3(0) > 0$. Due to the continuity of $\det \tilde{B}_3(\cdot)$ this implies that we can choose the constant $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ in such a way that for all $|z| \le 2\,\varepsilon_1$ we have $\det \tilde{B}_3(z) > 0$, and thus $\tilde{B}_3(z)$ is positive definite. We can choose the constant $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ in such a way that for all $|z| \le 2\,\varepsilon_1$ for the 2×2 matrix $\tilde{A}_3(z)$ the upper left element in the matrix is greater than zero. We have

$$\lim_{z \to 0+} C_g(z) = \infty. \tag{48}$$

Due to (48) we can assume that $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ is sufficiently small such that for all $|z| \le 2\,\varepsilon_1$ we have $\det \tilde{A}_3(z) > 0$, and thus $\tilde{A}_3(z)$ is positive definite.

In Lemma 4.2 we show several inequalities that we need to show that $E(t)$ as in (36) can be bounded above and below by the squared H^2-norm. Note that also in Lemma 4.2 the constants are independent of the length T of the time interval.

Lemma 4.2 *Let all assumptions of Lemma 4.1 hold. In particular, let k such that (38) holds be given. Let a stationary subsonic state $\bar{u}(x) \in C^2(0, L)$ be given. Assume that $\bar{u}$ is sufficiently small in the sense that (39) and (41) hold.*

For $x \in [0, L]$ and real numbers v_0 define the real function

$$k_1(x, v_0) = h_1(x)\,\left(a^2 - (\bar{u}(x) + v_0)^2\right) - 2\,h_2(x)\,(\bar{u}(x) + v_0). \tag{49}$$

If $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, we have

$$K_1 := \min_{x \in [0,L]} \min_{|v_0| \le \varepsilon_2} k_1(x, v_0) - \frac{h_2^2(x)}{h_1(x)} > 0, \tag{50}$$

$$\widetilde{K}_1 := \min_{x \in [0,L]} \min_{|v_0| \le \varepsilon_2} \frac{h_1(x)\,k_1(x, v_0) - h_2^2(x)}{k_1(x, v_0)} > 0. \tag{51}$$

Assume in the sequel that $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ is chosen such that (50) and (51) hold.

For $x \in [0, L]$ and real numbers v_0, v_1, v_2 define the real function

$$\chi^x(v_0, v_1, v_2) = \tag{52}$$

$$h_1(x)\left((a^2 - (\bar{u}(x) + v_0)^2)v_1^2 + v_2^2\right) - 2\,h_2(x)\left((\bar{u}(x) + v_0)v_1^2 + v_1 v_2\right). \tag{53}$$

Then χ^x can be represented in the form

$$\chi^x(v_0, v_1, v_2) \tag{54}$$

$$= \left(k_1(x, v_0) - \frac{h_2^2(x)}{h_1(x)}\right) v_1^2 + \left(\sqrt{h_1(x)}\,v_2 - \frac{h_2(x)}{\sqrt{h_1(x)}}\,v_1\right)^2 \tag{55}$$

$$= \frac{h_1(x)\,k_1(x, v_0) - h_2^2(x)}{k_1(x, v_0)}\,v_2^2 + \frac{1}{k_1(x, v_0)}\left(k_1(x, v_0)\,v_1 - h_2(x)\,v_2\right)^2. \tag{56}$$

Proof 4.2 *Inequality (40) implies that, if $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ is sufficiently small and $|v_0| < \varepsilon_2$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} k_1(x, v_0) &= h_1(x)\,[a - (\bar{u}(x) + v_0)]\,[a + (\bar{u}(x) + v_0)] - 2\,h_2(x)\,[\bar{u}(x) + v_0] \\ &> (h_2(x) - h_1(x)\,v_0)[a + \bar{u}(x) + v_0] - 2\,h_2(x)\,[\bar{u}(x) + v_0] \\ &= h_2(x)\,[a - \bar{u}(x)] - [(a + \bar{u}(x))\,h_1(x) + h_2(x)]\,v_0 - h_1(x)\,v_0^2 \\ &> \frac{h_2^2(x)}{h_1(x)} \end{aligned}$$

which implies (50). This in turn implies (51).

The representations (55) and (56) follow directly from the definition of χ^x.

In the sequel we assume that the assumptions from Lemma 4.1 hold. With χ^x as defined in Lemma 4.2 we have

$$E_1(t) = \int_0^L \chi^x(u(t,x),\, u_x(t,x),\, u_t(t,x))\,dx, \tag{57}$$

$$E_2(t) = \int_0^L \chi^x(u(t,x),\, u_{xx}(t,x),\, u_{tx}(t,x))\,dx. \tag{58}$$

With these representations of E_1 and E_2, Lemma 4.2 yields lower and upper bounds for $E_1(t)$ and $E_2(t)$.

Lemma 4.3 *Assume that*

$$\max_{x\in[0,L]} |u(t,x)| \le \varepsilon_2 \tag{59}$$

where ε_2 is chosen as in Lemma 4.2. For E_1 defined in (57) and k_1 defined in (49) we have the lower bounds

$$E_1(t) \ge \int_0^L \left(k_1(x, u(x)) - \frac{h_2^2(x)}{h_1(x)}\right) u_x^2(x)\,dx \ge K_1 \int_0^L u_x^2\,dx, \tag{60}$$

and

$$E_1(t) \ge \int_0^L \frac{h_1(x)k_1(x,u) - h_2^2(x)}{k_1(x,u)}\,u_t^2(x)\,dx \ge \widetilde{K}_1 \int_0^L u_t^2\,dx. \tag{61}$$

Moreover, we have the upper bounds

$$E_1(t) \le \int_0^L \left(k_1(x, u(t,x)) + \frac{h_2^2(x)}{h_1(x)}\right) u_x^2(t,x) + 2\,h_1(x)\,u_t^2(t,x)\,dx \tag{62}$$

and

$$E_1(t) \le \int_0^L 2\,h_1(x)\,\left(a^2 - (\bar{u} + u)^2\right) u_x^2(t,x) + 2\,h_1(x)\,u_t^2(t,x)\,dx. \tag{63}$$

For E_2 defined in (58), we have the lower bounds

$$E_2(t) \ge \int_0^L \left(k_1(x, u(x)) - \frac{h_2^2(x)}{h_1(x)}\right) u_{xx}^2(x)\,dx \ge K_1 \int_0^L u_{xx}^2\,dx, \tag{64}$$

and

$$E_2(t) \geq \int_0^L \frac{h_1(x)k_1(x,u) - h_2^2(x)}{k_1(x,u)} u_{tx}^2(x)\, dx \geq \widetilde{K}_1 \int_0^L u_{tx}^2\, dx. \tag{65}$$

Moreover, we have the upper bounds

$$E_2(t) \leq \int_0^L \left(k_1(x, u(t,x)) + \frac{h_2^2(x)}{h_1(x)} \right) u_{xx}^2(t,x) + 2\, h_1(x)\, u_{tx}^2(t,x)\, dx. \tag{66}$$

$$E_2(t) \leq \int_0^L 2h_1(x)\, \left(a^2 - (\bar{u}+u)^2\right) u_{xx}^2(t,x) + 2\, h_1(x)\, u_{tx}^2(t,x)\, dx. \tag{67}$$

Proof 4.3 *Equation (55) and (50) imply the lower bound (60) for E_1.*

The representation (56) and (51) imply the lower bound (61).

The upper bound (62) follows from (55) and Young's inequality. The upper bound (63) follows from (62) using $\frac{h_2^2}{h_1} < k_1$ and the definition of k_1.

The representations (55) and (50) also imply the lower bound (64) for E_2, and (56) and (51) imply the lower bound (65). The upper bound (66) again follows from (55) and Young's inequality. The upper bound (67) follows from (66) using $\frac{h_2^2}{h_1} < k_1$ and the definition of k_1.

Now we can show that $E(t)$ can be bounded above and below by the squared H^2-norm. Define the number

$$K_{\max} = \max\left\{ 2\, k,\ \max_{x\in[0,L]} \max_{|v_0|\leq \varepsilon_2} k_1(x, v_0) + \frac{h_2^2(x)}{h_1(x)} \right\}. \tag{68}$$

If (59) holds, by (62) and (66) Lemma 4.3 implies the inequality

$$E(t) \leq K_{\max} \int_0^L u^2(t,x) + u_x^2(t,x) + u_t^2(t,x) + u_{tx}^2(t,x) + u_{xx}^2(t,x)\, dx. \tag{69}$$

Define

$$K_{\min} = \frac{1}{2}\, \min\{K_1,\, \tilde{K}_1\}. \tag{70}$$

By the definition of E and (60), (61), (64), (65) we also have the lower bound

$$E(t) \geq K_{\min} \int_0^L u_x^2(t,x) + u_t^2(t,x) + u_{tx}^2(t,x) + u_{xx}^2(t,x)\, dx. \tag{71}$$

The Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality states that if (31) holds, we have

$$\int_0^L u^2(t,x)\, dx \leq 2\, L^2 \int_0^L u_x^2(t,x)\, dx. \tag{72}$$

Using this inequality and (25), inequality (71) implies that if $E(t)$ is small, also the H^2-norm of $u(t,x)$ is small. Similarly $E_1(t)$ can be bounded above and below by the squared H^1-norm.

4.2 Exponential Decay of the H^2-Lyapunov Function

In this section we present our main result about the exponential decay of the Lyapunov function that we have introduced in (36). Consider the system

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_{tt} + 2\,\tilde{u}\,\tilde{u}_{tx} - (a^2 - \tilde{u}^2)\,\tilde{u}_{xx} = \tilde{F}(\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}_x, \tilde{u}_t), \\ \tilde{u}_x(t,\,0) = \bar{u}_x(0) + k\,\tilde{u}_t(t,\,0),\ t \in [0, T], \\ \tilde{u}(t,\,L) = \bar{u}(L),\ t \in [0, T], \\ t = 0:\ \tilde{u} = \varphi(x) + \bar{u}(x),\ \tilde{u}_t = \psi(x), \quad x \in [0, L] \end{cases} \tag{73}$$

with $\tilde{F}$ as defined in (6). In Theorem 4.5 we present our main result about the stabilization of (73) for $\tilde{u}$. For the analysis we use the fact that (73) is equivalent to (25),(29),(30),(31) that is stated in terms of u which is defined in (24) as the difference between $\tilde{u}$ and the stationary state $\bar{u}$. In Theorem 4.5 we state that the function $E(t)$ defined in (36) is a strict Lyapunov function. In Theorem 4.5 it is assumed that $\bar{u} > 0$ is sufficiently small and k is sufficiently large. Before we state the theorem, in the following remark we comment on condition (76) that appears in the statement of the Theorem and explain why it can be satisfied for all $a > 0$ if $\bar{u} > 0$ is sufficiently small and k is sufficiently large.

Remark 4.4 *For $k > 0$ and $\bar{u}_0 > 0$ define*

$$K_\partial(k,\,\bar{u}_0) = 2\left[\frac{4}{k^2} + \frac{2\,\bar{u}_0}{k} + \theta\,\frac{\bar{u}_0^4 + 3a^2\bar{u}_0^2 + \frac{2}{k}a^2\bar{u}_0}{2(a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2)} + \frac{5}{2}\,\frac{\theta}{k^2} + \frac{\theta}{k}\,\frac{3a^2\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_0^3}{a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2}\right]^2. \tag{74}$$

Then (74) implies

$$\lim_{\bar{u}_0 \to 0+} K_\partial(k,\,\bar{u}_0) = \lim_{\bar{u}_0 \to 0+} 2\left[\frac{4}{k^2} + \frac{5}{2}\,\frac{\theta}{k^2}\right]^2 = \frac{2}{k^4}\left[4 + \frac{5}{2}\,\theta\right]^2.$$

This in turn implies that

$$\lim_{\bar{u}_0 \to 0+} 2\,k^2\,K_\partial(k,\,\bar{u}_0) - \left[a^2 - \left(\bar{u}_0 + \frac{2}{k}\right)^2\right] = \frac{4}{k^2}\left[4 + \frac{5}{2}\,\theta\right]^2 - a^2 + \frac{4}{k^2}.$$

Hence we have

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \lim_{\bar{u}_0 \to 0+} 2\,k^2\,K_\partial(k,\,\bar{u}_0) - \left[a^2 - \left(\bar{u}_0 + \frac{2}{k}\right)^2\right] = -a^2 < 0.$$

This implies that if $\bar{u}_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small and k is sufficiently large, then condition (76) with $\bar{u}(0) = \bar{u}_0$ in Theorem 4.5 below holds. In fact, if $\bar{u}_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small, for $k = \frac{1}{\bar{u}_0}$ condition (76) holds, since

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} 2\,k^2\,K_\partial\left(k,\,\frac{1}{k}\right) - \left[a^2 - \left(\frac{1}{k} + \frac{2}{k}\right)^2\right] = -a^2.$$

Theorem 4.5 (Exponential Decay of the H^2-Lyapunov Function). *Let a real number $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ be given. Choose a real number $k > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{a\,k} < 1 - \gamma. \tag{75}$$

Let a stationary subsonic state $\bar{u}(x) \in C^2(0, L)$ be given that satisfies (23). Assume that for all $x \in L$ we have $\bar{u}(x) \in (0,\, \gamma\, a)$. Assume that for $K_\partial(k,\, \bar{u}_0)$ as defined in (74) we have

$$2\, k^2\, K_\partial(k,\, \bar{u}(0)) \leq a^2 - \left(\bar{u}(0) + \frac{2}{k}\right)^2. \tag{76}$$

Assume that $\|\bar{u}\|_{C^2([0,L])}$ is sufficiently small such that $\|\bar{u}\|_{C([0,L])} < \varepsilon_1(2\, k^2)$ (with ε_1 from Lemma 4.1) and (41) holds.

Let $T > 0$ be given. If the initial data satisfies

$$\|(\varphi(x), \psi(x))\|_{C^2([0,L])\times C^1([0,L])} \leq \varepsilon_0(T) \tag{77}$$

and the C^2-compatibility conditions at the points $(t, x) = (0, 0)$ and $(t, x) = (0, L)$. the initial-boundary value problem (73) for $\tilde{u}$ has a unique classical solution $\tilde{u} \in C^2([0, T] \times [0, L])$. Problem (25),(29),(30),(31) has a unique classical solution $u \in C^2([0, T] \times [0, L])$ that satisfies the a priori estimate (33). Since $\varepsilon_1(\upsilon)$ from Lemma 4.1 with $\upsilon = 2\, k^2$ and ε_2 from Lemma 4.2 are independent of T, we can choose the constant $\varepsilon_0(T) > 0$ from Lemma 3.1 sufficiently small such that the a priori estimate (33) implies that

$$\|u\|_{C([0,T]\times[0,L])} \leq \min\{\varepsilon_1(2\, k^2),\, \varepsilon_2\} \tag{78}$$

and for all $t \in [0, T]$, $x \in [0, L]$ we have the inequalities

$$|u(t,\, x)| \leq \min\left\{\gamma\, a - |\bar{u}(x)|,\, |\bar{u}(x)|,\, \frac{1}{k}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad |u_x(t, x)| \leq \min\left\{1,\, \frac{1}{k}\right\}. \tag{79}$$

Moreover, choose $\varepsilon_0(T)$ and $\bar{u}$ sufficiently small such that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa \;&:=\; \max_{t\in[0,T]} (P_0(T_{Li}(t)) + P_1(T_{Li}(t)))(1 + L^2)\left(\frac{1}{K_1} + \frac{1}{\tilde{K}_1}\right) + 2\, k^2\, C_{E1}(\bar{u}(0))\, \frac{L}{K_1} \\ &\leq\; \frac{1}{4\, \mathrm{e}\, L\, k} \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

with the functions P_0, P_1 and C_{E1} defined in (101), (110), (117) and

$$T_{Li}(t) = \max_{x\in[0,L]} \{|u(t, x)|, |u_x(t, x)|, |u_t(t, x)|,\, |\bar{u}(x)|, |\bar{u}'(x)|\}. \tag{81}$$

Define the number

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2\, \mathrm{e}\, L\, k} - \kappa \geq \frac{1}{4\, \mathrm{e} L k}. \tag{82}$$

Then we have

$$E_1(t) \leq E_1(0)\, \exp(-\mu\, t) \;\text{ for all }\; t \in [0, T], \tag{83}$$

$$E(t) \leq E(0)\, \exp(-\mu\, t) \;\text{ for all }\; t \in [0, T] \tag{84}$$

that is $E_1(t)$ and $E(t)$ as defined in (36) are strict Lyapunov functions for our control system (73).

Remark 4.6 *Theorem 4.5 states that if $\bar{u} > 0$ is sufficiently small and k is sufficiently large for sufficiently small initial data the Lyapunov function decays exponentially and the decay rate is at least $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{4\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k}$ which is independent of $\bar{u}$ and T, since the conditions on k do not depend on T. For arbitrarily large T, we can always achieve this decay rate μ_0 for sufficiently small initial data. With this decay rate, it is possible to determine a time $T_0 > 0$ when the size of the $H^2 \times H^1$–norm of the solution is reduced at least by a factor 1/3. In fact let*

$$T_0 = 4\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k \ln\left(9\,(1+2\,L^2)\,\frac{K_{\max}}{K_{\min}}\right) \tag{85}$$

with $K_{\max}$ from (68) and $K_{\min}$ from (70). Then due to (71) and (72) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(u(T_0,\cdot),\,u_t(T_0,\cdot))\|^2_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \\ = & \int_0^L u^2(T_0,x) + u_x^2(T_0,x) + u_{xx}^2(T_0,x) + u_t^2(T_0,x) + u_{tx}^2(T_0,x)\,dx \\ \le & \frac{1+2\,L^2}{K_{\min}}\,E(T_0). \end{aligned}$$

If the assuption of Theorem 4.5 hold for the time interval $[0,\,T_0]$, by (84) and (69) this yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(u(T_0,\cdot),\,u_t(T_0,\cdot))\|^2_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \\ \le & \frac{1+2\,L^2}{K_{\min}}\,E(0)\,\exp\left(-\mu_0\,T_0\right) \\ \le & (1+2\,L^2)\frac{K_{\max}}{K_{\min}}\,\exp\left(-\mu_0\,T_0\right)\,\|(\varphi(x),\psi(x))\|^2_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \\ = & \frac{1}{9}\,\|(\varphi(x),\psi(x))\|^2_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \\ = & \frac{1}{9}\,\|(u(0,\,\cdot),u_t(0,\,\cdot))\|^2_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.7 (Exponential Decay of the H^2-Norm and the C^1-Norm) *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.5, for the semi-global classical solution u of the mixed initial-boundary value problem (25), (29), (30), (31) the H^2-norm decays exponentially with time on $[0,T]$. More precisely, there exists a constant $\eta_1 > 0$ that is independent of T such that for any $t \in [0,T]$ the inequality*

$$\|(u(t,\cdot),u_t(t,\cdot))\|_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \le \eta_1 \|(\varphi(x),\psi(x))\|_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu}{2}\,t\right) \tag{86}$$

holds. Furthermore, there exists a constant $\eta_2 > 0$ that is independent of T such that for any $t \in [0,T]$ the C^1-norm of the solution satisfies

$$\|(u(t,\cdot),u_t(t,\cdot))\|_{C^1[0,L]\times C^0[0,L]} \le \eta_2 \|(\varphi(x),\psi(x))\|_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu}{2}\,t\right). \tag{87}$$

Due to (82), this implies that for T sufficiently large we have

$$\|(u(T,\cdot),u_t(T,\cdot))\|_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \le \frac{1}{2}\|(\varphi(x),\psi(x))\|_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \tag{88}$$

and

$$\|(u(T,\cdot),u_t(T,\cdot))\|_{C^1[0,L]\times C^0[0,L]} \le \frac{1}{2}\|(\varphi(x),\psi(x))\|_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)}. \tag{89}$$

The proofs of Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.7 are given in Section 5.

5 Proofs of Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.7

In this section we prove Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.7 from Section 4.2. For the proof, we consider the time derivative of the Laypunov function $E(t)$.

5.1 Time derivative of the Lyapunov function

First we consider the evaluation of the time derivative of the Lyapunov function $E(t)$.

Lemma 5.1 *Let the assumptions of Theorem 4.5 hold. Then the time-derivative of E_1 is given by the following equation:*

$$\frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) \;=\; I_1 + I_2 + I_3$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_0^L h_{2x}\,(a^2-(\bar u+u)^2)\,u_x^2 + h_{2x}\,u_t^2\,dx, &(90)\\
I_2 &= \int_0^L 2\,h_1(\bar u'+u_x)\,u_t^2 - 2\,h_1\,(\bar u+u)u_t\,u_x^2 + 4\,h_1(\bar u+u)(\bar u'+u_x)u_x u_t\\
&+ 2\,h_1\,F\,u_t - 2\,h_2\,u_t\,u_x^2 - 2\,h_2\,(\bar u+u)(\bar u'+u_x)u_x^2 - 2\,h_2\,F\,u_x\,dx, &(91)\\
I_3 &= [(a^2-(\bar u+u)^2)(2\,h_1\,u_x\,u_t - h_2\,u_x^2) - (2\,h_1\,(\bar u+u)+h_2)\,u_t^2]_{x=0}^L. &(92)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof 5.1 *With the notation $\hat d = a^2-(\bar u+u)^2$ we have $\hat d_t = -2(\bar u+u)\,u_t$, $\hat d_x = -2(\bar u+u)\,(\bar u'+u_x)$ and*

$$E_1(t) = \int_0^L h_1\Big(\hat d\,u_x^2 + u_t^2\Big) - 2\,h_2\,\Big((\bar u+u)u_x^2 + u_t\,u_x\Big)\,dx.$$

Hence differentiation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) &= \int_0^L 2\,h_1\Big[(u_{tt}-(\bar u+u)\,u_x^2)\,u_t + \hat d\,u_x\,u_{xt}\Big]\\
&- 2\,h_2\,\Big[u_t\,u_x^2 + (u_{tt}+2(\bar u+u)\,u_{xt})u_x + u_t\,u_{xt}\Big]\,dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Now integration by parts for the term $\hat d\,u_x\,u_{xt} = \Big(\hat d\,u_x\Big)\,(u_t)_x$ yields the equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) &= \int_0^L 2\,h_1\Big[u_{tt} - \hat d\,u_{xx} - \hat d_x\,u_x - (\bar u+u)\,u_x^2\Big]\,u_t\\
&- 2\,h_2\,\Big[u_t\,u_x^2 + (u_{tt}+2(\bar u+u)\,u_{xt})u_x + u_t\,u_{xt}\Big]\,dx + \Big[2\,h_1\,\hat d\,u_x\,u_t\Big]_{x=0}^L.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) = \int_0^L 2\,h_1\left[(u_{tt}-\hat{d}\,u_{xx})\,u_t - \hat{d}_x\,u_x\,u_t - (\bar{u}+u)u_x^2u_t\right]\\ - 2\,h_2\,\left[u_tu_x^2 + (u_{tt}+2(\bar{u}+u)u_{tx})u_x + u_tu_{tx}\right]\,dx\\ + \left[2h_1\,\hat{d}\,u_x\,u_t\right]_{x=0}^L.\end{aligned}$$

By the partial differential equation (25) we have $u_{tt}-\hat{d}\,u_{xx} = F - 2(\bar{u}+u)u_{tx}$ *and obtain*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) = \int_0^L 2h_1\left[(F-2(\bar{u}+u)u_{tx})u_t + 2(\bar{u}+u)(\bar{u}'+u_x)u_tu_x - (\bar{u}+u)u_t\,u_x^2\right]\\ - 2h_2\left[(F+\hat{d}\,u_{xx})u_x + u_t\,u_x^2 + u_t\,u_{tx}\right]\,dx + \left[2\,h_1\,\hat{d}\,u_x\,u_t\right]_{x=0}^L.\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

Using integration by parts we obtain the identities

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^L -4h_1(\bar{u}+u)u_tu_{tx}\,dx &= \int_0^L -2h_1(\bar{u}+u)(u_t^2)_x\,dx\\ &= [-2h_1u_t^2(\bar{u}+u)]_{x=0}^L + \int_0^L 2\,(h_1(\bar{u}+u))_xu_t^2\,dx\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^L -2\,h_2\,\hat{d}\,u_xu_{xx} - 2\,h_2\,u_t\,u_{tx}\,dx &= \int_0^L -h_2\,\hat{d}\,(u_x^2)_x - h_2\,(u_t)_x^2\,dx\\ = [-h_2\,\hat{d}\,u_x^2 - h_2\,u_t^2]_{x=0}^L + \int_0^L h_{2x}\,\hat{d}\,u_x^2 - 2\,h_2(\bar{u}+u)(\bar{u}'+u_x)\,u_x^2 + h_{2x}\,(u_t)^2\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Using these identities we obtain the equation $\frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) = I_1+I_2+I_3$. *Here,* I_3 *contains all the terms coming from the boundary and* $I_1 = \int_0^L h_{2x}\,\hat{d}\,u_x^2 + h_{2x}\,u_t^2\,dx$ *contains all the terms where* h_{2x} *appears. The remaining terms appear in* I_2.

Similarly the next lemma is proved, where the time derivative of E_2 is considered.

Lemma 5.2 *Let the assumption of Theorem 4.5 hold. Then the following equation holds:*

$$\frac{d}{dt}E_2(t) = \tilde{I}_1+\tilde{I}_2+\tilde{I}_3 \tag{94}$$

with

$$\tilde{I}_1 = \int_0^L h_{2x}\,(a^2-(\bar{u}+u)^2)\,u_{xx}^2 + h_{2x}\,u_{tx}^2\,dx, \tag{95}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{I}_2 &= \int_0^L 4\,h_2\,(\bar{u}'+u_x)\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx} - 2\,h_2\,u_t\,u_{xx}^2 + 2\,h_2\,(\bar{u}+u)\,(\bar{u}'+u_x)\,u_{xx}^2\\ &- 2h_2\,F_x\,u_{xx} - 2h_1\,(\bar{u}+u)\,u_t\,u_{xx}^2 - 2h_1\,(\bar{u}'+u_x)\,u_{tx}^2 + 2h_1\,F_x\,u_{tx}\,dx,\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

$$\tilde{I}_3 = [(a^2-(\bar{u}+u)^2)(2h_1\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx} - h_2\,u_{xx}^2) - (2\,h_1\,(\bar{u}+u)+h_2)u_{tx}^2]_{x=0}^L. \tag{97}$$

Proof 5.2 *Again using the notation* $\hat{d} = a^2 - (\bar{u}+u)^2$ *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}E_2(t) &= \int_0^L 2\,h_1\Big[\,u_{ttx}\,u_{tx} - (\bar{u}+u)\,u_{xx}^2\,u_t + \hat{d}\,u_{xx}\,u_{xxt}\Big] \\ &- 2\,h_2\left[u_t\,u_{xx}^2 + (u_{ttx} + 2(\bar{u}+u)\,u_{xxt})\,u_{xx} + u_{tx}\,u_{txx}\right]dx.\end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts for the term $\hat{d}\,u_{xx}\,u_{xxt} = \left(\hat{d}\,u_{xx}\right)(u_{tx})_x$ *yields the equation*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}E_2(t) &= \int_0^L 2\,h_1\Big[u_{ttx}\,u_{tx} - (\bar{u}+u)\,u_{xx}^2\,u_t\; - \hat{d}\,u_{xxx}\,u_{tx} - \hat{d}_x\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx}\Big]dx \\ &+ \Big[2\,h_1\,\hat{d}\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx}\Big]_{x=0}^{L} \\ &- \int_0^L 2\,h_2\left[u_t\,u_{xx}^2 + (u_{ttx} + 2(\bar{u}+u)\,u_{xxt})\,u_{xx} + u_{tx}\,u_{txx}\right]dx.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}E_2(t) &= \int_0^L 2\,h_1\Big[(u_{ttx} - \hat{d}\,u_{xxx})\,u_{tx} - (\bar{u}+u)\,u_{xx}^2\,u_t\; - \hat{d}_x\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx}\Big]dx \\ &+ \Big[2\,h_1\,\hat{d}\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx}\Big]_{x=0}^{L} \\ &- \int_0^L 2\,h_2\left[u_t\,u_{xx}^2 + (u_{ttx} + 2(\bar{u}+u)\,u_{xxt})\,u_{xx} + u_{tx}\,u_{txx}\right]dx.\end{aligned}$$

By the partial differential equation (25) we have

$$u_{ttx} - \hat{d}\,u_{xxx} = \hat{d}_x\,u_{xx} + F_x - 2(\bar{u}' + u_x)u_{tx} - 2(\bar{u}+u)u_{txx}$$

and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}E_2(t) &= \int_0^L 2\,h_1\Big[\left(\hat{d}_x\,u_{xx} + F_x - 2(\bar{u}' + u_x)u_{tx} - 2(\bar{u}+u)u_{txx}\right)\,u_{tx} \\ &- (\bar{u}+u)\,u_{xx}^2\,u_t\; - \hat{d}_x\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx}\Big]dx + \Big[2\,h_1\,\hat{d}\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx}\Big]_{x=0}^{L} \\ &- \int_0^L 2\,h_2\left[u_t\,u_{xx}^2 + \left(\hat{d}\,u_{xxx} + \hat{d}_x\,u_{xx} + F_x - 2\,(\bar{u}' + u_x)u_{tx}\right)\,u_{xx} + u_{tx}\,u_{txx}\right]dx \\ &= \int_0^L 2\,h_1\Big[\,(F_x - 2(\bar{u}' + u_x)u_{tx} - 2(\bar{u}+u)u_{txx})\;u_{tx} - (\bar{u}+u)\,u_{xx}^2\,u_t\,\Big]dx \\ &+ \Big[2\,h_1\,\hat{d}\,u_{xx}\,u_{tx}\Big]_{x=0}^{L} \\ &- \int_0^L 2\,h_2\left[u_t\,u_{xx}^2 + \left(\hat{d}\,u_{xxx} + \hat{d}_x\,u_{xx} + F_x - 2\,(\bar{u}' + u_x)u_{tx}\right)\,u_{xx} + u_{tx}\,u_{txx}\right]dx.\end{aligned}$$

Using integration by parts we obtain the identities

$$\int_0^L -2\,h_2\left(\hat{d}\,u_{xxx} + \hat{d}_x\,u_{xx}\right)\,u_{xx} - 2\,h_2\,u_{tx}\,u_{txx}\,dx$$

$$= \int_0^L -h_2\,\hat{d}\,(u_{xx}^2)_x - 2\,h_2\,\hat{d}_x\,(u_{xx})^2 - h_2\,(u_{tx}^2)_x\,dx$$

$$= \int_0^L h_{2x}\hat{d}\,u_{xx}^2 + h_{2x}u_{tx}^2 + 2\,h_2\,(\bar{u}+u)(\bar{u}'+u_x)\,u_{xx}^2\,dx$$
$$+ \left[-h_2\,\hat{d}\,u_{xx}^2 - h_2\,u_{tx}^2\right]_{x=0}^L$$

and

$$\int_0^L -4h_1(\bar{u}+u)u_{tx}\,u_{txx}\,dx = [-2\,h_1\,(\bar{u}+u)\,u_{tx}^2]_{x=0}^L + \int_0^L 2\,h_1\,(\bar{u}'+u_x)\,u_{tx}^2\,dx.$$

Using these identities we obtain $\frac{d}{dt}E_2(t) = \tilde{I}_1 + \tilde{I}_2 + \tilde{I}_3$ *where* $\tilde{I}_3$ *contains all the terms coming from the boundary and* $\tilde{I}_1 = \int_0^L h_{2x}\,\hat{d}\,u_{xx}^2 + h_{2x}\,u_{tx}^2\,dx$ *contains all the terms where* h_{2x} *appears.*

5.2 Proof of Theorem 4.5

Proof 5.3 *In the proof, we use Lemma 4.1. Therefore we assume that* $\bar{u}$ *is sufficiently small in the sense that (41) holds. Moreover, we use Lemma 4.2. Therefore we assume that* $\varepsilon_0(T) > 0$ *is sufficiently small such that (78) holds. We have*

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(t) = \frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) + \frac{d}{dt}E_2(t). \tag{98}$$

First we consider $\frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) = I_1 + I_2 + I_3$. *Define* $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{L}$. *By the definition of* h_2 *in (35) we have* $(h_2)_x = -\mu_2\,h_2$ *and thus*

$$I_1 = -\int_0^L \left(a^2 - (\bar{u}+u)^2\right)\,\mu_2\,h_2\,u_x^2 + \mu_2\,h_2\,u_t^2\,dx. \tag{99}$$

For all $x \in [0,\,L]$ *we have* $\mu_2\,h_2(x) \geq \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}\,L}$ *hence we have*

$$I_1 \leq -\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k}\int_0^L 2\,h_1\,(a^2 - (\bar{u}+u)^2)\,u_x^2 + 2\,h_1\,u_t^2\,dx.$$

Thus, by (63) we have

$$I_1 \leq -\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k}\,E_1(t). \tag{100}$$

Now we consider the term I_2 *as defined in (91). Note that due to (28), each of the terms that are added in* I_2, *in particular* $F\,u_t$ *and* $F\,u_x$, *contains a second order term of* u, u_t, u_x *as a factor, that is* $u\,u_t$, $u\,u_x$, $u_x\,u_t$, u_x^2 *or* u_t^2.

More precisely, the terms that appear as factors are either third order terms $u_tu_x^2$, $u_xu_t^2$, u_x^3, uu_x^2, uu_xu_t, uu_t^2 *or terms of the form* $\theta\bar{u}\,uu_t$, $\theta\bar{u}\,uu_x$, $\theta\bar{u}\,u_xu_t$, $\theta\bar{u}\,u_x^2$ *or* $\theta\bar{u}\,u_t^2$. *Since we have* $h_1(x) = k$ *and* $\max_{x\in[0,L]}|h_2(x)| = 1$, *the definition of* I_2 *implies that there exists a continuous function* P_0 *with* $P_0(0) = 0$ *such that we have an estimate of the form*

$$I_2 \leq P_0\left(\max_{x\in[0,L]}\{|u(t,x)|, |u_x(t,x)|, |u_t(t,x)|, |\bar{u}(x)|\}\right)\int_0^L \left(u^2 + u_t^2 + u_x^2\right)\,dx.$$

In fact, the definitions of I_2, F and $\tilde{F}$ imply that we can choose

$$\begin{aligned} P_0(t) &= 4\,k\,t^2 + 2k\Big(1+\frac{\theta}{2}\Big)t + 4\,k\Big(1+\frac{\theta}{2}\Big)t^2 + 2t + 4\Big(1+\frac{\theta}{2}\Big)t^2 \\ &+ 2(k+1)\Big[\theta^2\frac{3a^4t^4+2a^2t^6+t^8}{2(a^2-t^2)^3} + \theta\frac{a^2t}{a^2-t^2} + \theta\frac{t^4+3a^2t^2}{2(a^2-t^2)} \\ &+ \theta^2\frac{2t^7+3a^2t^5+3a^4t^3}{4(a^2-t^2)^3}t + 2t^2 + \theta\frac{3a^2t+t^3}{a^2-t^2}t \\ &+ 2t + 2t^2 + \frac{3}{2}\theta t^2 + \theta t\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Using (72), and then (60), (61) we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\le P_0\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\int_0^L \left(u_t^2+u_x^2\right)\,dx \\ &\le P_0\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\left(\frac{1}{K_1}+\frac{1}{\tilde{K}_1}\right)E_1(t). \end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

Now we focus on the boundary term I_3. We use the notation $\bar{u}_0 := \bar{u}(0)$ and $\bar{u}_L := \bar{u}(L)$. Since $k > 0$, by the boundary conditions (30), (31) we have

$$I_3 = I_3^L - I_3^0 \tag{103}$$

where

$$I_3^L = -(a^2-\bar{u}_L^2)\,e^{-1}u_x^2(t,L) \tag{104}$$

$$I_3^0 = \left(a^2 - \left((\bar{u}_0+u(t,0)) + \frac{1}{k}\right)^2\right)u_x^2(t,0). \tag{105}$$

Since (79) holds, we have $|\bar{u}_0+u(t,0)| \le |\bar{u}_0| + \gamma\,a - |\bar{u}_0| = \gamma a \le a - \frac{1}{k}$. Hence we have $I_3^0 \ge 0$. Since $I_3^L \le 0$, due to (103) this implies

$$I_3 \le 0. \tag{106}$$

Then inequalities (100), (102) and (106) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}E_1(t) &\le -\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k}E_1(t) + P_0\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\left(\frac{1}{K_1}+\frac{1}{\tilde{K}_1}\right)E_1(t) \\ &= -\left(\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k} - P_0\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\left(\frac{1}{K_1}+\frac{1}{\tilde{K}_1}\right)\right)E_1(t). \end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

With (80) this implies that $E_1(t)$ is a strict Lyapunov function and (83) holds.

Similarly, for $\tilde{I}_1$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_1 &= -\int_0^L (a^2-(\bar{u}+u)^2)\,\mu_2\,h_2\,u_{xx}^2 + \mu_2\,h_2\,u_{tx}^2\,dx \\ &\le -\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k}\int_0^L (a^2-(\bar{u}+u)^2)\,2\,h_1\,u_{xx}^2 + 2\,h_1\,u_{tx}^2\,dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (67) yields

$$\tilde{I}_1 \le -\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k}E_2(t). \tag{108}$$

Now we consider $\tilde{I}_2$ as defined in (96). All the terms that are added in $\tilde{I}_2$ are contain factors $u_{xx}\,u_{tx}$, u_{xx}^2, u_{tx}^2, $F_x\,u_{xx}$, $F_x\,u_{tx}$. Except for $F_x\,u_{xx}$, $F_x\,u_{tx}$, it can easily be seen that the coefficients that are multiplied with these quadratic terms become arbitrarily small if if $T_{Li}(t)$ as defined in (81) is sufficiently small.

Now we have a closer look at F_x. From (28), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_x &= -2u_xu_{tx} - 2u_tu_{xx} - 2u_x^3 - 4uu_xu_{xx} - 3\theta uu_x^2 - \frac{3}{2}\theta u^2u_{xx} - \theta u_xu_t - \theta uu_{tx}\\
&- \theta^3\frac{9a^6\bar{u}^3 - 2\bar{u}^9 - 6a^4\bar{u}^5 - 11a^2\bar{u}^7}{8(a^2-\bar{u}^2)^4}u^2 - \theta^2\frac{\bar{u}^7 + 6a^4\bar{u}^3 - 3a^2\bar{u}^5}{2(a^2-\bar{u}^2)^3}uu_x\\
&- \theta\frac{\bar{u}^3}{a^2-\bar{u}^2}u_x^2 - 4\bar{u}u_xu_{xx} - \theta\frac{3a^2\bar{u} - \bar{u}^3}{a^2-\bar{u}^2}(u_x^2 + uu_{xx})\\
&- \theta^3\frac{6a^6\bar{u}^6 + 4a^2\bar{u}^{10} - \bar{u}^{12} - 3a^4\bar{u}^8}{2(a^2-\bar{u}^2)^5}u - \theta^2\frac{a^4\bar{u}^3 + a^2\bar{u}^5}{2(a^2-\bar{u}^2)^3}u_t - \theta^2\frac{3a^4\bar{u}^4}{(a^2-\bar{u}^2)^3}u_x\\
&- \theta\frac{a^2\bar{u}}{a^2-\bar{u}^2}u_{tx} - \theta\frac{3a^2\bar{u}^2 + \bar{u}^4}{2(a^2-\bar{u}^2)}u_{xx}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also in $F_x\,u_{xx}$, $F_x\,u_{tx}$ all the terms that are added contain quadratic factors $u_{xx}\,u_{tx}$, u_{xx}^2, u_{tx}^2, $u_x\,u_{xx}$, $u_x\,u_{tx}$, $u_t\,u_{xx}$, $u_t\,u_{tx}$, $u\,u_{xx}$, $u\,u_{tx}$ and the coefficients that are multiplied with these factors become arbitrarily small if if $T_{Li}(t)$ as defined in (81) is sufficiently small. Thus similar as in the estimate of I_2, we can find a continuous function $P_1(t)$ with $P_1(0) = 0$ such that using (72), and then (60), (61) we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{I}_2 &\le P_1\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\int_0^L \left(u_t^2 + u_x^2 + u_{tx}^2 + u_{xx}^2\right)dx\\
&\le P_1\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\left(\frac{1}{K_1} + \frac{1}{\tilde{K}_1}\right)(E_1(t) + E_2(t)).
\end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

In fact if we replace in the representation of F_x in each of the terms that are added except for one factor the expressions u, u_x, u_t, u_{xx}, u_{tx}, $\bar{u}$ by t, and treat the other terms from the definition of $\tilde{I}_2$ in a similar way since $h_1 = k$ and $|h_2| \le 1$ we can choose

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1(t) &= 8\,t + 2\,t + 8\,t^2 + 4\,k\,t^2 + 4\,k\,t\\
&+ 2(k+1)\Big[\theta^3\frac{9a^6t^2 + 2t^9 + 6a^4t^5 + 11a^2t^7}{8(a^2-t^2)^4}t + \theta^2\frac{t^7 + 6a^4t^3 + 3a^7}{2(a^2-t^2)^3}t\\
&+ \theta\frac{t^3}{a^2-t^2}t + 4t^2 + \theta\frac{3a^2t + t^3}{a^2-t^2}2t + \theta^3\frac{6a^6t^6 + 4a^2t^{10} + t^{12} + 3a^4t^8}{2(a^2-t^2)^5}\\
&+ \theta^2\frac{a^4t^3 + a^2t^5}{2(a^2-t^2)^3} + \theta^2\frac{3a^4t^4}{(a^2-t^2)^3} + \theta\frac{a^2t}{a^2-t^2} + \theta\frac{3a^2t^2 + t^4}{2(a^2-t^2)}\\
&+ 2t + 2t + 2t^2 + 4t^2 + 3\theta t^2 + \frac{3}{2}\theta t^2 + \theta t + \theta t\Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

For the boundary term $\tilde{I}_3$, we use (25) in the form

$$(a^2 - (\bar{u}+u)^2)\,u_{xx} = u_{tt} + 2(\bar{u}+u)u_{tx} - F.$$

In particular, for $x = L$ due to (31) we have $u(t,L) = u_t(t,L) = u_{tt}(t,L) = 0$, hence at $x = L$ we get

$$(a^2 - \bar{u}_L^2)\,u_{xx}(t,L) = 0 + 2\,\bar{u}_L\,u_{tx}(t,L) - F(t,L).$$

Using (28) and the definition of $\tilde{F}$ we obtain

$$F(t,L) = -\bar{u}_L \left(\frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,\bar{u}_L + 4\,\bar{u}_x(L)\right) u_x(t,L) - 2\,\bar{u}_L\,u_x^2(t,L).$$

Due to (79) this yields

$$|F(t,L)| \le \bar{u}_L \left(\frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,\bar{u}_L + 4|\bar{u}_x(L)| + 2\right) |u_x(t,L)|. \tag{111}$$

We have

$$\tilde{I}_3 = \tilde{I}_3^L - \tilde{I}_3^0$$

where $\tilde{I}_3^0$ is given in (118) and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{I}_3^L &= \left[2\,k\,u_{tx}(t,\,L) - \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,u_{xx}(t,\,L)\right]\left[2\,\bar{u}_L\,u_{tx}(t,\,L) - F(t,\,L)\right] - \left(2\,k\,\bar{u}_L + \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\right) u_{tx}^2(t,\,L)\\
&= \left[2\,k\,u_{tx}(t,\,L) - \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,\frac{2\,\bar{u}_L\,u_{tx}(t,\,L) - F(t,\,L)}{a^2-\bar{u}_L^2}\right]\left[2\,\bar{u}_L\,u_{tx}(t,\,L) - F(t,\,L)\right]\\
&- \left(2\,k\,\bar{u}_L + \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\right) u_{tx}^2(t,\,L)\\
&= \left[2\,k\,\bar{u}_L - \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,\frac{a^2+3\bar{u}_L^2}{a^2-\bar{u}_L^2}\right] u_{tx}^2(t,\,L)\\
&+ \left[\frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,\frac{4\bar{u}_L}{a^2-\bar{u}_L^2} - 2\,k\right] u_{tx}(t,\,L)\,F(t,\,L) - \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}\,\frac{1}{a^2-\bar{u}_L^2}\,F(t,\,L)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

With $C_g(\bar{u}_L)$ as defined in (46) we have

$$C_g(\bar{u}_L) = \frac{a^2-\bar{u}_L^2}{\mathrm{e}\,\bar{u}_L^2}\,\frac{1}{\left(\frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,\bar{u}_L + 4\,|\bar{u}_x(L)| + 2\right)^2} = \frac{a^2-\bar{u}_L^2}{\mathrm{e}\,\bar{u}_L^2\left(2 + \frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,\bar{u}_L + \frac{2\,\theta\,\bar{u}_L^3}{a^2-\bar{u}_L^2}\right)^2} > 0. \tag{112}$$

Then due to (111) we have $C_g(\bar{u}_L)\,F(t,L)^2 \le (a^2-\bar{u}_L^2)\,\mathrm{e}^{-1}\,u_x^2(t,L)$. Hence (104) implies

$$I_3^L + C_g(\bar{u}_L)\,F(t,L)^2 \le \left[-\frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}(a^2-\bar{u}_L^2) + \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}}(a^2-\bar{u}_L^2)\right] u_x^2(t,L) = 0. \tag{113}$$

Consider the matrix $\tilde{A}_3(\bar{u}_L)$ as defined in (47). With the notation $F = F(t,L)$ and $u_{tx} = u_{tx}(t,\,L)$ we have

$$\tilde{I}_3^L - C_g\,F^2 = -(u_{tx},\,F)\,\tilde{A}_3(\bar{u}_L)\begin{pmatrix} u_{tx} \\ F \end{pmatrix}.$$

Due to (78), Lemma 4.1 implies that the matrix $\tilde{A}_3(\bar{u}_L)$ is positive definite. Thus $\tilde{I}_3^L - C_g\,F^2 \le 0$. Due to (113) this yields

$$I_3^L + \tilde{I}_3^L = I_3^L + C_g\,F^2(t,L) + \tilde{I}_3^L - C_g\,F^2(t,L) \le 0. \tag{114}$$

Now we look at $\tilde{I}_3^0$ that depends on the values at $x = 0$ where the Neumann condition (30) is prescribed and we have $u_t(t,0) = \frac{1}{k}\,u_x(t,0)$, $u_{tt}(t,0) = \frac{1}{k}\,u_{xt}(t,0)$.

Hence with the notation $F(t,\,0) = F(u(t,\,0)\,, u_x(t,\,0),\, u_t(t,\,0)\,)$ *and* $\bar{u}(t,\,0) = \bar{u}_0$ *for* $x = 0$, *(25) yields*

$$u_{xx}(t,\,0) = \frac{1 + 2\,k\,(\bar{u}_0 + u(t,\,0))}{k\,(a^2 - (\bar{u}_0 + u(t,\,0))^2)}\,u_{tx}(t,\,0) - \frac{1}{(a^2 - (\bar{u}_0 + u(t,\,0))^2)}\,F(t,\,0). \tag{115}$$

Due to (28) we have for $x = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} F(t,0) &= -2\left[\frac{1}{k} + \bar{u}_0 + u\right]\,u_x^2 \\ &- \left[\theta\,\frac{\bar{u}_0^4 + 3a^2\bar{u}_0^2 + \frac{2}{k}a^2\bar{u}_0}{2(a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2)} + \frac{\theta}{k}\,u + \frac{3}{2}\,\theta\,u^2 + \theta\,\frac{3a^2\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_0^3}{a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2}\,u\right]\,u_x \\ &- \theta^2\frac{3a^4\bar{u}_0^4 - 2a^2\bar{u}_0^6 + \bar{u}_0^8}{2(a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2)^3}\,u - \theta^2\,\frac{2\bar{u}_0^7 - 3a^2\bar{u}_0^5 + 3a^4\bar{u}_0^3}{4(a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2)^3}\,u^2. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (79) this yields

$$\begin{aligned} |F(t,0)| &\leq 2\left[\frac{2}{k^2} + \frac{\bar{u}_0}{k}\right]\,|u_x(t,\,0)| \\ &+ \left[\theta\,\frac{\bar{u}_0^4 + 3a^2\bar{u}_0^2 + \frac{2}{k}a^2\bar{u}_0}{2(a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2)} + \frac{5}{2}\,\frac{\theta}{k^2} + \frac{\theta}{k}\,\frac{3a^2\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_0^3}{a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2}\right]\,|u_x(t\,,0)| \\ &+ \frac{\theta^2}{k}\left[\frac{6ka^4\bar{u}_0^4 - 4ka^2\bar{u}_0^6 + 2k\bar{u}_0^8 + 2\bar{u}_0^7 - 3a^2\bar{u}_0^5 + 3a^4\bar{u}_0^3}{4(a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2)^3}\right]\,|u(t,\,0)|\,. \end{aligned}$$

With $K_\partial(k,\,\bar{u}_0)$ *as defined in (74) due to Young's inequality we have*

$$F(t,0)^2 \leq K_\partial(k,\,\bar{u}_0)\,u_x^2(t,\,0) + C_{E1}(\bar{u}_0)\,u(t,\,0)^2 \tag{116}$$

with the constant

$$C_{E1}(\bar{u}_0) = 2\,\frac{\theta^4}{k^2}\,\left[\frac{6ka^4\bar{u}_0^4 - 4ka^2\bar{u}_0^6 + 2k\bar{u}_0^8 + 2\bar{u}_0^7 - 3a^2\bar{u}_0^5 + 3a^4\bar{u}_0^3}{4(a^2 - \bar{u}_0^2)^3}\right]^2. \tag{117}$$

With the notation $h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t) = \bar{u}_0 + u(t,0)$ *using (115) we obtain*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_3^0 &= -\frac{1}{a^2 - h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t)^2}\,F^2(t,0) + 2\left(\frac{1 + 2k\,h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t)}{k\,(a^2 - h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t)^2)} - k\right)\,F(t,0)\,u_{tx}(t,0) \\ &+ \left(1 + 2\,k\,h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t) - \frac{(1 + 2\,k\,h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t))^2}{k^2\,(a^2 - h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t)^2)}\right)\,u_{tx}^2(t,0). \end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

For $\upsilon := 2\,k^2 > k^2$ *we have*

$$\tilde{I}_3^0 + \upsilon\,F(t,0)^2 = (u_{tx}(t,\,0),\,F(t,\,0))\,\tilde{B}_3(h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t))\,\begin{pmatrix} u_{tx}(t,\,0) \\ F(t,\,0) \end{pmatrix}$$

with the matrix $\tilde{B}_3(h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t))$ *from (45). Since we have assumed that* $|\bar{u}_0| < \varepsilon_1(2\,k^2)$ *and* $|u(t,\,0)| < \varepsilon_1(2\,k^2)$, *by the definition of* $h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t)$ *this implies* $|h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t)| < 2\,\varepsilon_1(2\,k^2)$

hence Lemma 4.1 implies that the matrix $\tilde{B}_3(h_{\tilde{B}_3}(t))$ is positive definite. Thus we have $\tilde{I}_3^0 + \upsilon\, F(t,0)^2 \geq 0$. Hence due to (105), (79), (116) and (76) we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^0 + \tilde{I}_3^0 &= I_3^0 - 2\,k^2\,F(t,0) + \tilde{I}_3^0 + 2\,k^2\,F(t,0) \\ &\geq I_3^0 - 2\,k^2\,F(t,0) \\ &\geq \left(a^2 - \left(\bar{u}_0 + \frac{2}{k}\right)^2 - 2\,k^2\,K_\partial(k,\,\bar{u}_0)\right) u_x^2(t,\,0) - 2\,k^2\,C_{E1}(\bar{u}_0)\,u(t,\,0)^2 \\ &\geq -2\,k^2\,C_{E1}(\bar{u}_0)\,u(t,\,0)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the Dirichlet boundary condition (31) we have

$$u(t,\,0)^2 = |u(t,\,0) - u(t,\,L)|^2 = \left|\int_0^L u_x(t,\,s)\,ds\right|^2 \leq L\int_0^L u_x^2(s)\,ds \leq \frac{L}{K_1}E_1(t)$$

where the last inequality follows from (60). This yields

$$I_3^0 + \tilde{I}_3^0 \geq -2\,k^2\,C_{E1}(\bar{u}_0)\,\frac{L}{K_1}E_1(t). \tag{119}$$

We have

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(t) = I_1 + I_2 + \tilde{I}_1 + \tilde{I}_2 + (I_3^L + \tilde{I}_3^L) - (I_3^0 + \tilde{I}_3^0).$$

Then inequalities (100), (102), (108), (109), (114) and (119) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}E(t) \;\leq\; & -\left[\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k} - P_0\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\left(\frac{1}{K_1} + \frac{1}{\tilde{K}_1}\right)\right] E_1(t) \\ & -\left[\frac{1}{2\,\mathrm{e}\,L\,k} - P_1\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\left(\frac{1}{K_1} + \frac{1}{\tilde{K}_1}\right)\right] E_2(t) \\ & +\left[P_1\left(T_{Li}(t)\right)(1+L^2)\left(\frac{1}{K_1} + \frac{1}{\tilde{K}_1}\right) + 2\,k^2\,C_{E1}(\bar{u}_0)\,\frac{L}{K_1}\right] E_1(t). \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

Note that due to (33), $T_{Li}(t)$ becomes arbitrarily small if the norm of the initial data and of $\bar{u}$ is sufficiently small. Define the number $\kappa > 0$ as in (80) and μ as in (82). Then (120) and the definition of μ yield

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(t) \leq -\mu\,E(t) \text{ for all } t \in [0,T], \tag{121}$$

which implies inequality (84).

5.3 Proof of Corollary 4.7

Now we present the proof of Corollary 4.7.

Proof 5.4 *For all $t \in [0,\,T]$ the inequalities (71) and (72) for the H^2-Lyapunov function $E(t)$ defined in (36) imply the following inequalities*

$$\|u(t,\cdot)\|_{H^2(0,L)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1+2L^2}{K_{\min}}}\sqrt{E(t)}, \tag{122}$$

$$\|u_t(t,\cdot)\|_{H^1(0,L)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{K_{\min}}}\sqrt{E(t)}. \tag{123}$$

Inequality (69) implies for $t = 0$:

$$\sqrt{K_{\max}}\,\|(u(0,\cdot),u_t(0,\cdot))\|_{H^2(0,L)\times H^1(0,L)} \geq \sqrt{E(0)}. \tag{124}$$

With the positive constants

$$\tau_1 := \frac{K_{\min}}{1+2L^2}, \quad \tau_2 := K_{\max} \quad , \eta_1 := 2\sqrt{\tau_2/\tau_1}, \tag{125}$$

the inequalities (122), (123), (84), (124) imply the estimate (86).

The inequality (87) follows from (86) and the Sobolev embedding $H^2((0,L)) \hookrightarrow C^1([0,L])$ and $H^1((0,L)) \hookrightarrow C^0([0,L])$, see ([3],[34]).

Theorem 4.5 implies that for all $T > 0$ the decay rate $\mu = \frac{1}{4\,\mathrm{e}Lk}$ can be achieved for sufficiently small initial data. With this decay rate, for

$$T \geq \max_{i\in\{1,\,2\}} 8\,\mathrm{e}\,Lk\ln(2\,\eta_i), \tag{126}$$

and $i \in \{1,\,2\}$ we have the inequality $\eta_i \exp\left(-\frac{\mu}{2}T\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Hence the inequalities (86) and (87) imply the inequalities (88) and (89).

6 Global solutions

In this section we show that the exponential decay of the Lyapunov function defined in (36) implies that the solution exists global in time without losing regularity, that is it keeps the regularity of the initial state.

Let us first observe that (9) implies that the eigenvalues $\lambda_- = (-a+\bar{u}+u)$ and $\lambda_+ = (a+\bar{u}+u)$ do not depend on the derivatives of u. Therefore for a given value of $T > 0$, $(s,x,t) \in [0,T]\times[0,L]\times[0,T]$, the field of characteristic curves $\xi^u_\pm(s,x,t)$ corresponding to $u \in C^1([0,T]\times[0,L])$ defined by the integral equation

$$\xi^u_\pm(s,x,t) = x \pm a(s-t) + \int_t^s \bar{u}(\xi^u_\pm(\tau,x,t)) + u(\tau,\,\xi^u_\pm(\tau,x,t))\,d\tau \in [0,L] \tag{127}$$

is well-defined for a C^1-function u if $\bar{u}$ and u have sufficiently small C^1-norm.

In order to obtain a semi-global C^1-solution of (25), (30), (31) in the sense of integral equations along these characteristic curves, the boundary condition (30) at $x = 0$ is written in the form of the integral equation

$$u(t,0) = u(0,0) + \frac{1}{k}\int_0^t u_x(s,0)\,ds. \tag{128}$$

To be precise we define $(r_+,r_-) = (R_+ - \bar{R}_+, R_- - \bar{R}_-)$. Then we have $u = -\frac{1}{2}(r_+ + r_-)$. Thus the boundary condition (31) at $x = L$ is equivalent to

$$r_-(t,L) = -r_+(t,L) \tag{129}$$

and (128) is equivalent to

$$r_+(t,0) = -r_-(t,0) + (r_+(0,0)+r_-(0,0)) + \frac{1}{k}\int_0^t (r_+)_x(s,0) + (r_-)_x(s,0)\,ds. \tag{130}$$

Due to (10), (r_+, r_-) satisfies the system in diagonal form

$$\partial_t \begin{pmatrix} r_+ \\ r_- \end{pmatrix} + \hat{D}(\bar{R}_+ + r_+, \bar{R}_- + r_-)\, \partial_x \begin{pmatrix} r_+ \\ r_- \end{pmatrix} \tag{131}$$

$$= \hat{S}(\bar{R}_+ + r_+, \bar{R}_- + r_-) - \hat{S}(\bar{R}_+, \bar{R}_-) \tag{132}$$

$$+ \left[\hat{D}(\bar{R}_+, \bar{R}_-) - \hat{D}(\bar{R}_+ + r_+, \bar{R}_- + r_-)\right] \partial_x \begin{pmatrix} \bar{R}_+ \\ \bar{R}_- \end{pmatrix}. \tag{133}$$

Let $t^u_\pm(x,t) \le t$ denote the time where $\xi^u_\pm(s,x,t)$ hits the boundary of $[0,T]\times[0,L]$. Then (11) implies that (r_+, r_-) satisfy the integral equations

$$\begin{aligned} r_\pm(t,x) &= r_\pm(t^u_\pm(x,t),\ \xi^u_\pm(t^u_\pm(x,t),\ x,t)) \\ &+ \int_{t^u_\pm(x,t)}^{t} p_\pm(r_+ + r_-)(s,\ \xi^u_\pm(s,\ x,t))\, ds \end{aligned}$$

with

$$p_\pm(z) = \frac{\theta}{2}[\frac{1}{4}z^2 - \bar{u}\, z] + \frac{1}{2}[\partial_x \bar{R}_\pm]z. \tag{134}$$

Now we consider the initial boundary value problem with initial data for (r_+, r_-) at $t = 0$, the equation in diagonal form (131)-(133) and the boundary conditions (129), (130).

Let a time $T > 0$ be given such that (88) holds. With initial data for (r_+, r_-) in $[C^1([0,L])]^2$ at $t = 0$ that are sufficiently small (with respect to the C^1-norm), compatible to u and satisfy the C^1–compatibility conditions for (129), (130), as in [27] we obtain a semi-global classical solution $(r_+, r_-) \in C^1([0,T]\times[0,L])$. Thus we also get a continuously differentiable function $u = -\frac{1}{2}(r_+ + r_-)$ for $(t,x) \in [0,\, T]\times[0,\, L]$.

If our initial data for (r_+, r_-) at $t = 0$ are more regular, namely in $[H^2(0,L)]^2$ and satisfy the assumptions that we just mentioned, they generate a solution that is more regular than the classical solution in general: For all $t \in [0,T]$ the second partial derivatives $(\partial_{xx} r_+,\, \partial_{xx} r_-)$ are in $L^2(0,L)$. This can be seen as follows.

For initial data with sufficiently small H^2-norm also the C^1-norm is small. Thus we know that a classical semi-global solution exists on $[0,T]$ and we can fix the corresponding characteristic curves. As a consequence, we obtain a semilinear evolution for $(\partial_{xx} r_+,\, \partial_{xx} r_-)$ with fixed characteristic curves. The evolution of $\partial_{xx} r_\pm$ is governed by the integral equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{xx} r_\pm(t,x) &= \partial_{xx} r_\pm(t^u_\pm(x,t),\ \xi^u_\pm(t^u_\pm(x,t),\ x,t)) \\ &+ \int_{t^u_\pm(x,t)}^{t} P_\pm(r_+, r_-, \partial_x r_+, \partial_x r_-, \partial_{xx} r_+, \partial_{xx} r_-)(s,\ \xi^u_\pm(s,\ x,t))\, ds \end{aligned}$$

with a polynomial $P_\pm$ (with C^1-coefficients, similar to $p_\pm$) that is affine linear with respect to $\partial_{xx} r_\pm$. We can consider $t^u_\pm(x,t)$, $\xi^u_\pm(s,x,t)$, $r_+, r_-, \partial_x r_+, \partial_x r_-$ as given continuous functions. Then $\partial_{xx} r_\pm(t,\cdot) \in L^2(0,L)$ is given as the solution of a family of linear integral equations. Thus we can show that $\partial_{xx} r_\pm(t,\cdot) \in L^2(0,L)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. This implies that the lifespan of the H^2-solution only depends on the C^1-norm of (r_+, r_-), so in particular it is well-defined on the time interval $[0,T]$.

Thus we can construct a global H^2-solution as follows:

Since we have chosen $T > 0$ such that (88) holds, for nonzero initial data (φ, ψ) with sufficiently small $H^2 \times H^1$-norm, we obtain an H^2-solution on $[0, T]$ as described above and due to (88) the $H^2 \times H^1$ norm of $(u(T, \cdot), u_t(T, \cdot))$ is less than the $H^2 \times H^1$ norm of $(u(0, \cdot), u_t(0, \cdot))$. Thus we can start our construction again with initial data $(u(T, \cdot), u_t(T, \cdot))$ where the $H^2 \times H^1$ norm has been decreased at least by a factor $\frac{1}{2}$ to obtain an H^2-solution on the time interval $[T, 2\,T]$. By repeating the procedure iteratively, for initial data (φ, ψ) with sufficiently small $H^2 \times H^1$-norm, we thus obtain a solution that is well defined for all $t > 0$. Moreover, Lemma 2 in [20] implies that the $H^2 \times H^1$-norm of the solution decays exponentially with time. In addition, Theorem 4.5 implies that also the Lyapunov function $E(t)$ decays exponentially with time. The above considerations yield the following result.

Theorem 6.1 (Global Exponential Decay of the H^2-Lyapunov Function). *Let a stationary subsonic state $\bar{u}(x) \in C^2(0, L)$ be given that satisfies (23). Let $\gamma \in (0, 1/2]$ be given. Assume that for all $x \in L$ we have $\bar{u}(x) \in (0, \gamma\, a)$. Choose a real number $k > \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\, a}$. Assume that $\bar{u}$ is sufficiently small and k sufficiently large such that for $K_\partial(k, \bar{u}(0))$ as defined in (74) condition (76) holds. Assume that $\|\bar{u}\|_{C^2([0,L])}$ is sufficiently small such that $\|\bar{u}\|_{C([0,L])} < \varepsilon_1(2\,k^2)$ and (41) holds. Choose ε_2 as in Lemma 4.2. Define T as in (126).*

Choose a real number $\tilde{\varepsilon}_0 \in (0, \varepsilon_0(T))$ sufficiently small such that for all initial data that satisfies

$$\|(\varphi(x), \psi(x))\|_{H^2([0,L])\times H^1([0,L])} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_0 \tag{135}$$

and the C^1-compatibility conditions at the points $(t, x) = (0, 0)$ and $(t, x) = (0, L)$ the solution of problem (25),(29),(30),(31) exists on the time-interval $[0,\, T]$. Moreover, assume that $\tilde{\varepsilon}_0 > 0$ and $\bar{u}$ are sufficiently small such that (78), (79) and (80) hold.

If the initial data satisfies (135), the mixed initial-boundary value problem (73) ((25), (29), (30), (31) respectively) has a unique solution $u \in L^\infty((0, \infty), H^2[0, L])$ with $u_t \in L^\infty((0, \infty), H^1[0, L])$. For the number $\mu \in [\frac{1}{4\,e L k}, \frac{1}{2\,e\,L\,k})$ defined in (82) we have the inequality

$$E(t) \leq E(0)\, \exp(-\mu\, t) \text{ for all } t > 0 \tag{136}$$

with the strict Lyapunov function $E(t)$ as defined in (36). Moreover, we have

$$E_1(t) \leq E_1(0)\, \exp(-\mu\, t) \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

7 Summary and outlook

In this paper we have considered a quasilinear wave equation for the velocity of a gas flow that is governed by the isothermal Euler equations with friction. We have presented a method of boundary feedback stabilization to stabilize the velocity locally around a given stationary state. For the proof, we have introduced a strict H^2-Lyapunov function (see (36)).

We have shown that, for initial conditions with sufficiently small $C^2 \times C^1$-norm and for appropriate boundary feedback conditions, the $H^2 \times H^1$-norm of the solution decays exponentially with time. In addition, we have shown that with our velocity

feedback law, for initial data with sufficiently small $H^2 \times H^1$-norm the solution exists globally in time and the $H^2 \times H^1$-norm of the solution decays exponentially.

In this paper, the strict H^2-Lyapunov function is used to prove the stability of the solution. It would also be interesting to consider other types of Lyapunov functions, such as weak Lyapunov functions. Moreover, when a disturbance is considered, Input-to-State Stability Lyapunov functions should be studied (see [29],[30]).

We have presented our stabilization method for a single pipe applying an active control at an end of the pipe. Some additional work is required to extend this method to more complicated gas networks. For the stabilization of networks it is often necessary to apply an active control in the interior of the networks. The well-posedness of systems of balance laws on networks is studied in [17]. For a star-shaped network of vibrating strings governed by the wave equation, a method of boundary feedback stabilization is presented in [19], where not for each string an active control is necessary. A related open problem is the feedback stabilization of more complicated pipe networks with leaks. Moreover, also feedback stabilization of second-order hyperbolic equations with time-delayed controls is worth to be studied. For wave equations, this has been done in [14] and in [31] and for the isothermal Euler equations with an L^2-Lyapunov function in [15]. In the current paper we have considered an ideal gas with constant sound speed. It would be interesting to look at more realistic models of gas where the sound speed also depends on the pressure.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by DFG in the framework of the Collaborative Research Centre CRC/Transregio 154, Mathematical Modelling, Simulation and Optimization Using the Example of Gas Networks, project C03 and project A03, by the DFG-Priority Program 1253: Optimization with partial differential equation (grant number GU 376/7-1) and the Excellent Doctoral Research Foundation for Key Subject of Fudan University (No. EHH1411208). We thank the reviewers for the careful reading and the comments that helped to improve the paper.

References

[1] F. Alabau-Boussouira, L. Rosier and V. Perrollaz, *Finite-time Stabilization of a Network of Strings*, Mathematical Control and Related Fields (MCRF) 5, (2015), 721–742.

[2] H. Alli and T. Singhj, *On the feedback control of the wave equation*, Journal of Sound and Vibration, **234** (2000), 625–640.

[3] H. Attouch, G. Buttazzo and G. Michaille, "Variational Analysis in Sobolev and BV Spaces: Applications to PDEs and Optimization", Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Programming Society, Philadelphia, 2006.

[4] M. K. Banda, M. Herty and A. Klar, *Coupling conditions for gas networks governed by the isothermal Euler equations*, Netw. Heterog. Media, **1** (2006), 295–314.

[5] M. K. Banda, M. Herty and A. Klar, *Gas flow in pipeline networks*, Netw. Heterog. Media, **1** (2006), 41–56.

[6] R. M. Corless , G. H. Gonnet , D. E. G. Hare , D. J. Jeffrey and D. E. Knuth, *On the Lambert W Function*, Adv. Comp. Math., **2** (1996), 329-359.

[7] J. M. Coron and G. Bastin, *Dissipative Boundary Conditions for One-Dimensional Quasi-linear Hyperbolic Systems: Lyapunov Stability for the C^1-Norm,* SIAM J. Control Optim. 53, 1464-1483, 2015.

[8] J. M. Coron, B. d'Andréa-Novel and G. Bastin, *A strict Lyapunov function for boundary control of hyperbolic systems of conservation laws*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control, **52** (2007), 2–11.

[9] J. M. Coron, G. Bastin and B. d'Andréa-Novel *Disspative boundary conditions for one-dimensional nonlinear hyperbolic systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **47** (2008), 1460–1498.

[10] J. M. Coron, *Control and nonlinearity*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 136, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.

[11] M. Dick, M. Gugat and G. Leugering, *A Strict H^1-Lyapunov function and feedback stabilization for the isothermal Euler equations with friction*, Numerical Algebra Control and Optimization, **1** (2011), 225–244.

[12] M. Dick, M. Gugat and G. Leugering, *Classical solutions and feedback stabilization for the gas flow in a sequence of pipes*, Netw. Heterog. Media, **5** (2010), 691–709.

[13] J. M. Greenberg and T. T. Li, *The effect of boundary damping for the quasi-linear wave equation*, J. Differential Equations, **52** (1984), 66–75.

[14] M. Gugat, *Boundary feedback stabilization by time delay for one-dimensional wave equations*, IMA J. Math. Control Inform., **27** (2010), 189–203.

[15] M. Gugat and M. Dick, *Time-delayed boundary feedback stabilization of the isothermal Euler equations with friction*, Math. Control and Related Fields, **1** (2011), 469–491.

[16] M. Gugat, F. Hante, M. Hirsch-Dick and G. Leugering, *Stationary states in gas networks*, Netw. Heterog. Media, **10** (2015), 295–320.

[17] M. Gugat, M. Herty, A. Klar, G. Leugering and V. Schleper, "Well-posedness of networked hyperbolic systems of balance laws", International Series of Numerical Mathematics, 160, 2012, 123–146.

[18] M. Gugat, G. Leugering, S. Tamasoiu and K. Wang, *H^2-stabilization of the Isothermal Euler equations: a Lyapunov function approach*, Chinese Annals of Mathematics, Series B 33 (2012), Nr. 4, S. 479-500.

[19] M. Gugat and M. Sigalotti, *Stars of vibrating strings: switching boundary feedback stabilization*, Netw. Heterog. Media, **5** (2010), 299–314.

[20] M. Gugat, M. Tucsnak, *An example for the switching delay feedback stabilization of an infinite dimensional system: The boundary stabilization of a string*, Syst. Cont. Lett. 60, pp. 226-233, 2011.

[21] M. Gugat, *Optimal Boundary Control and Boundary Stabilization of Hyperbolic Systems*, SpringerBriefs in Control, Automation and Robotics, Springer, New York, New York, 2015.

[22] L. Hörmander, *Lectures on Nonlinear Hyperbolic Differential Equations*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1997.

[23] T. J. R. Hughes, T. Kato and J. E. Marsden, *Well-posed quasi-linear second-order hyperbolic systems with applications to nonlinear elastodynamics and general relativity*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **63** (1977), 273–294.

[24] V. Komornik, *Rapid boundary stabilization of the wave equation*, SIAM J. Control and Optimization 29, 197-208, 1991.

[25] J.H. Lambert, *Observationes variae in mathesin puram*, Acta Helvetica, physico-mathematico-anatomico-botanico-medica **3** (1758), 128-168.

[26] T. T. Li, *Global Classical Solutions for Quasilinear Hyperbolic Systems*, RAM Res. Appl. Math. 32, Masson, Paris, 1994.

[27] T. T. Li and W. C. Yu, *Boundary Value Problems for Quasilinear Hyperbolic Systems*, Duke Univ. Math. Ser. V, 1985.

[28] T. T. Li and Bopeng Rao and Zhiqiang Wang *A note on the one-side exact boundary observability for quasilinear hyperbolic systems*, Georgian Mathematical Journal 15 (2008), 571-580.

[29] Z. H. Luo, B. Z. Guo and O. Morgul, *Stability and Stabilization of Infinite Dimensional Systems with Applications*, Communications and Control Engineering Series. Springer-Verlag London Ltd., London, 1999.

[30] F. Mazenc and C. Prieur, *Strict Lyapunov functions for semilinear parabolic partial differential equations*, Math. Control and Related Fields, **1** (2011), 231–250.

[31] S. Nicaise, J. Valein and E. Fridman, *Stability of the heat and of the wave equations with boundary time-varying delays*, Disc. Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S, **2** (2009), 559–581.

[32] M. Slemrod, *Boundary feedback stabilization for a quasilinear wave equation, in Control Theory for Distributed Parameter Systems and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, **54** (1983), 221–237.

[33] M. E. Taylor, "Partial Differential Equations", Tome III, Nonlinear equations, Applied Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 117, Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1996.

[34] M. Tucsnak and G. Weiss, "Observation and Control for Operator Semigroups", Birkhäuser, Basel-Boston-Berlin, 2009.

[35] Z. Q. Wang, *Exact boundary controllability for nonautonomous quasilinear wave equations*, Math. Meth. Appl. Sci., **30** (2007), 1311–1327.

[36] G. P. Zou, N. Cheraghi and F. Taheri, Fluid-induced vibration of composite natural gas pipelines, *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, **42** (2005), 1253–1268.